DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 394 SO 021 486

AUTHOR	Barth, James L., Ed.
TITLE	Identifying What Is Unique about the Social Studies. Bulletin 1.
INSTITUTION	National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 89
NOTE	93p.; Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (68th, Orlando, FL, November 20, 1988). For related documents, see SO 021 487-488. A product of the Foundations of the Social Studies Special Interest Group.
AVAILABLE FROM	Foundations of the Social Studies SIG, 1809 Bluebird Lane, Munster, IN 46321 ($4.00).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational History; Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Foundations of Education; *Role of Education; *Social Studies

ABSTRACT

A collection of six papers about the foundations and history of the social studies discipline focus on the task of identifying what is unique about social studies. The papers include: "Social Studies: Born Out of Crisis and Change" (James Barth); "A Coming of Age: Social Studies as a Proactive Force" (Walter Schultz); "Social Studies Education: A Brief View of the Social Education Debate, c. 1910s" (David Warren Saxe); "Social Studies Education: Roots That Remain Fundamental" (Susanne Shafer); "The Two Cultures of Social Studies Education" (James S. Leming); and "Practical Competence: A Rationale for Social Education" (James S. Whitson; William B. Stanley). (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337394

Identifying What is Unique About the Social Studies

Bulletin 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

WALTER SCHULTZ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 021 484

Foundations of the Social Studies Special Interest Group

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Identifying What is Unique About the Social Studies

James L. Barth
James S. Leming
David Warren Saxe
Walter Schultz
Susanne M. Shafer
William B. Stanley
James A. (Tony) Whitson

BULLETIN 1

JANUARY, 1989

THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES / SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP

A SIG OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES

CONTENTS

Foreword ii

1. Social Studies: Born Out of Crisis and Change 1

2. A Coming of Age: Social Studies as a Proactive Force 9

3. Social Studies Education: A Brief View of the Social Education Debate, C. 1910's 20

4. Social Studies Education: Roots That Remain Fundamental 31

5. The Two Cultures of Social Studies Education 53

6. Practical Competence: A Rationale for Social Education 69

FOREWORD

The publication of the papers in this bulletin mark the Foundations of the Social Studies Special Interest Group's first publishing venture. The six papers of the bulletin deal with the program theme of **"Identifying What Is Unique About the Social Studies."** They were presented at Orlando, Florida at the 68th Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, November 20, 1988.

The Foundations of the Social Studies -- Special Interest Group is an organization devoted to the study of the historical, philosophical, cultural and sociological foundations of the social studies. The Foundations group came into being at the 1977 NCSS Annual Meeting in Cincinnati. In its eleven year history it has presented a variety of programs at the NCSS convention, including the "Old Masters" presentations, highlighting the contributions of notables in the field, which have been published in the Journal of Thought, The Indiana Social Studies Quarterly, and The International Journal of Social Education. In addition the Foundations group has sponsored a number of NCSS pre-conference presentations, at Stanford (1983), the National Archives (1984), the Newberry Library (1985) and Teachers College (1986).

As the FSS/SIG's contribution to understanding what is unique about social studies, six papers were commissioned for presentation at the 1988 NCSS annual meeting and for publication in this bulletin. The papers group themselves into three slightly different themes on the uniqueness of social studies.

The first two papers by Barth and Schultz offer an interpretation of the growth and development of the social studies movement. A second set of

papers by Saxe and Shafer concentrate on the early historical development of the field with emphasis upon the movement just after the turn of the century and developments in the 30's, noting those educators who were influential in developing foundational ideas from which the movement continued to evolve. The last set of papers by Leming and Whitson and Stanley examine the problems that have evolved with the development of the field. These three themes suggest the complex nature of the social studies movement over the last eighty-five years.

The membership of the FSS/SIG hopes that this publication will stimulate what this organization is designed to offer -- continued dialogue on the social studies, a dialogue on how the reform movement should be understood and point to directions that the movement might be following.

James L. Barth
Editor, FSS/SIG

Walter Schultz
Executive Secretary, FSS/SIG

SOCIAL STUDIES: BORN OUT OF CRISIS AND CHANGE

James L. Barth

Purdue University

> The country was in the midst of significant change. Change brought crisis, but that crisis was not easily controlled, and in consequence some educators thought that the foundational beliefs and values of the country were under attack... In short, social studies was the first subject field created to deal with the crisis of a changing society. The country had to effectively deal with change if democracy and the freedom which were loudly proclaimed were to continue as guides to the future.

This week I was examining several general introduction to education textbooks, and as is my preference, I often turn to the introductory discussion on social studies as a part of the school curriculum. Most of the general introduction textbooks are very much alike, so the text cited here, American Education, 9th Edition, 1988, should be considered a prototype. The authors of this text begin their discussion on social studies with the following paragraph.

> The social studies curriculums of the schools could be described as a hodge-podge of subject matter that lacks coherence and rigor. There is little agreement among scholars as to what should be included in social studies and how it should be taught.[1]

Wynn and Wynn, the authors, continue the rest of the introduction to social studies by suggesting that, "the major challenge of social studies education is to teach young citizens. . .to cherish the historical ideas and values of American Democracy,"[2] and in the very next paragraph suggest that social studies should help "the young to think critically."[3]

That introduction pretty well sums up an educator's uneducated view of social studies. On the one hand, social studies is a hodge-podge lacking coherence and rigor; on the other, as social studies teachers, we should

indoctrinate a national cherished vision while, of course, stimulating critical thoughts. It is not uncommon to find books, articles, commentaries, and a good number of scholarly papers ringing out bad news with an absolute statement like:

> The field of social studies is so caught up in ambiguity,consistency, and contradiction that it represents a complex educational enigma. It also has defied any final definition acceptable to all factions of the field.[4]

Surely, social studies born out of conflict and crisis is complex, but it does not follow that because consensus cannot be reached on exactly how social studies should be defined, organized and taught, it lacks a coherent if not consistent historical or philosophical tradition. The study of the foundations of the social studies shows a different story. The historical foundations show the development of a field that has strong competing philosophical traditions. Agreement and consistency generally lie within each of the competing traditions. It is true that no one tradition's view of definition, organization, and how best to instruct has yet achieved consensus among social studies educators, but suggestion of a hodge-podge, inconsistent enigma is a misinterpretation. The confusion of Wynn and Wynn, as well as many other educators, is well understood because they have not had an opportunity to study the "social studies old masters" who over the past seven decades have evolved a social studies literature which clearly denies that social studies lacks a coherent tradition.

Surely social studies educators should be admonished for not discussing the historical foundations that have always supported the reasons for the field. This lack of discussion has left a knowledge vacuum that has often been filled by the well intended but misinformed of which the New Social Studies of the 1950s-70s is a most vivid recent example. Also apologists and critics have been very successful at pointing out their

divergence on issues of purpose, methods, and content, ignoring the shared history of ideas that support the founding of the field. In short, most often arguments about social studies take place without reference to the foundations of the social studies. The consequences are, to name a few, the misleading introduction by the Wynns, the outcries of Secretary Bennett, and confusion for the general public.

What should Wynn and Wynn have known about the emergence of social studies after the turn of the century that might have changed their introductory explanation of social studies? A brief summation of the historical tradition that social studies teachers share might include the following.

Social Studies Born of Crisis

Social studies as a school curriculum emerged in the early part of the 20th century as an answer to what modern social critics and some educators called a crisis. The country was in the midst of significant change. Change brought crisis, but that crisis was not easily controlled, and in consequence some educators thought that the foundational beliefs and values of the country were under attack. Rapid change from rural to urban, agriculture to industrial revolution, independent to interdependent, and a further crisis, heavy immigration from non-western countries, foretold the possible loss of western traditional beliefs and values. World War I fueled a sense of urgency and laid a foundation for rapid adoption of an integrated social studies curriculum as a change from traditional history, government, and geography. In short, social studies was the first subject field created to deal with the crisis of a changing society. The country had to effectively deal with change if democracy and the freedom which were loudly proclaimed were to continue as guides to the future. The Wynns

could have said that social studies was specifically created by educators in the 20th century as a response to a crisis generated by social, political, and economic change.

Social Studies: A Powerful Means to Control Change

There can be little question that the social studies founders who included sociologists, geographers, and educators, conceived the field as potentially a powerful means of controlling change. Within the context of crisis social studies could be easily understood and expressed as: democracy to be preserved by practicing with one's contemporaries decision-making on critical issues throughout a school curriculum. That curriculum should be developmental and the themes and concepts integrated in such a way that students would be practicing, during their school years, the skills required of effective citizens in a democratic society. The crisis could be managed, the critical issues thoughtfully considered, and traditional values and beliefs, if they continue to be viable, would be preserved. These were to be the result of a social studies citizenship program.

The founders seemed to be in agreement that the good of the past could not be preserved if citizens were unable to identify, understand, and control the changes which were daily altering their lives. Change brought crisis, but it also brought the opportunity for greater choice. The responsibility of making effective choices in a complex, democratic, pluralistic society was not to be left to chance, decision-making needed to be channeled by some rational process. The preservations of citizens' ability to affect the quality of their lives might well depend upon effective decision-making skills. The complex choices, the critical issues were the inheritance realized in the 20th century. The school social

studies program was to become part of the solution instead of continuing, as its discipline centered predecessor, to be part of the problem.

In sum, what can be said about social studies from a study of its foundations? The field was to be set in a climate of change, crisis, and uncertainty that would address the critical issues of the 20th century in such a way that students would practice decision-making within a context of critically examined traditional American beliefs and values. Of course, there would be differences on what content should be studied, what methods would motivate practice, and how best to prepare citizens to participate in decisions on the quality of their lives. Some would argue that indoctrination of the so-called shared American values and beliefs, is the sure road to effective citizenship. Others suggest a reflective inquiry approach that requires the identifying of personal/social problems that are rigorously processed and critically examined through a system of proof. One other strong tradition suggests that a structure of knowledge approach, if rigorously applied through a reflective process, would ensure a knowledgeable, thoughtful citizen. Serious disagreement does exist between competing conceptions of how best to educate a citizen. Nevertheless, these competitors share a common social studies foundation. It is the disagreements and competition that are the focus of attention, the common foundations are ignored.

The founders, now referred to as the old masters, had a vision of social studies that was based on change, crisis, critically examined traditional American values, and a rational decision-making process. Whether that vision will continue as a guide for the instruction of social studies remains to be seen. Perhaps for most social studies teachers, according to national studies over the past decade, the old masters were

interpreted to mean that decision-making is equivalent to inculcation through a passive coverage of textbook content. The integration of the themes and concepts through the expanding horizons curriculum approach continues to find the greatest acceptance. And finally, the old masters' admonition to preserve the traditional American beliefs and values has become the centerpiece of instruction, the purpose of textbooks, and the construction of objective exams. Whether these interpretations prepare citizens for effective decision-making during the 20th century will have to remain for the moment in the hands of historians, who may have a better perspective in the future. However, the need is for a continuous commentary on how the social studies foundations are conceived and interpreted. It would not be unthinkable to suppose that the teaching of social studies in the 21st century will be based on a reinterpretation of the foundational arguments of the old masters. That process of re-examination and interpretation is the theme of this 1988 FSS/SIG meeting where we are concentrating on what is unique about the social studies.

FSS/SIG Dedicated to Leaving a Paper Trail

Over the past eight years the members of the Foundations of the Social Studies Special Interest Group(SIG) of the National Council for the Social Studies have thought it their obligation to concentrate their scholarship on the foundational history of ideas that have supported the growth and development of social studies. The SIG members are determined to leave a paper trail for those educators who follow, with the specific goal in mind of providing a commentary necessary for any future understanding of where the field has been, is now, and might be in the future. For those who are searching for the meaning of social studies and for what is unique about the field, the following contemporary commentaries generated by the FSS

members over the past ten years are appropriate.

The History of the Social Studies, a 1980 Fall issue of Theory and Research in Social Education.

Historical Foundations of Social Studies Educators, Virginia Atwood's 1982 edited collection of Old Masters for the Journal of Thought.

Issues in Social Education: A 50 Year Retrospective edited by William Stanley, running through the 1985 issues of Social Education.

Founders of the Social Studies, in the 1985-86 Winter issue of the Indiana Social Studies Quarterly, edited by J.L. Barth.

Founders and Old Masters on the Social Studies, International Journal of Social Education, Winter issue, 1988-89, edited by J.L. Barth.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Richard Wynn and Joanne Lindsay Wynn, American Education, 9th Edition (New York: Harper and Row, 1988), p. 276.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Robert D. Barr, James L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis, Defining the Social Studies, Bulletin 51 (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977), p. 1.

A Coming of Age: Social Studies as a Proactive Force

Walter Schultz

Executive Secretary FSS/SIG

> In looking to the roots of the field we can get some clues, largely based on the particular orientation of the practitioner doing the research, as to whether the aim of the social studies field was to prepare the student for social service or to control the individual. Or asked another way, "Do the social studies train citizens -- or subjects?"

At the 1987 meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies in Dallas, a session was presented entitled "Social Studies: An Examination of Definition and Structure." The session brought together a panel of social studies educators and charged them (albeit, for only a two hour period of time) with identifying the unique role of the social studies in the schools. At the end of the two hours of deliberation and exchange, no definitive examples or statements of the uniqueness of the social studies field had been advanced. This fact may or may not be revealing, since during the relatively long existence of the National Council for the Social Studies, no one person or group to date, has been able to set forth a definition of the field - as to what is, or what are the social studies.

Some three years ago, in 1985, through the combined efforts of the American Historical Association, The Organization of American Historians, The National Council for the Social Studies, and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools came into being. Its mission will be to thoroughly examine the courses now being taught under the guise of the social studies label, and to make recommendations for needed curricular changes. In an overview

issued by the Commission, it state that the Commission believes "a new and coherent vision of the social studies in general education must be developed. Through a series of investigations and hearings it is hoped this new vision will be based upon a realistic analysis of what it is that students must know, value, and be able to do if they are to be effective citizens."

In reflecting upon the work to be done by the Commission, Fran Haley, Executive Director of the National Council for the Social Studies, in the September 1987 issue of Social Education said, "Perhaps, after their deliberations have been completed, they will recommend that the term 'social studies' be dropped and replaced with - who knows what? She concludes, "social studies educators must figure out a way to teach about the complex world to children. Changing the name isn't going to do it."

The efforts of the Commission on Social Studies in the Schools to examine and define what constitutes the field are not new. The Committee on Social Studies, part of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (C.R.S.E.), constituted in 1912 and convened in 1916, was the sixth effort in a span of twenty or so years to deal with the content, scope and sequence of the social studies (Lybarger). This committee was unique, because while previous groups had been sponsored by a variety or professional associations, each with its own special interests to be served, this was the first professional investigatory group to be constituted and charged by the National Education Association. This body was also special in that a significant number of classroom teachers had been selected to participate in the activities of the Commission. Prior to this, only the Committee of Eight had teachers represented, and then only twenty-five percent (Lybarger). The work of the C.R.S.E. is to be

considered truly critical, for it was only in the decades of the sixties and seventies that we would see the pattern of courses originally recommended by the Committee on Social Studies begin to show any signs of changing.

Examining the work and recommendations of the various commissions is a logical starting point in attempting to trace the development and foundations of the social studies. But one must also look at the conditions prevalent in the United States at the time, in order to gain an insight into the circumstances that originally caused these bodies to be convened. The one glaring fact that stands out is that the United States was changing. Until the time of the Civil War the population of the country was basically homogeneous. We were "small Town" -- with a value system that came from the community in which we lived and worked. People knew each other by name, and felt a sense of responsibility for one another. This community spirit helped to reinforce the rules, and more importantly the values that governed people's lives.

As America recovered from the Civil war, the socio-economic makeup of the United States began to change very rapidly, becoming increasingly complex. The economic base was now less dependent on agriculture, with attention increasingly being focused on industrialization. America was quickly losing its simple agrarian or rural character, and beginning to take on a more sophisticated, urban look. As science and technology continued to advance, a society began to emerge in which the dominant characteristic was to become social change. As Barr put it, "the functioning of industrialization, mechanization, automation, and improved communication and transportation made possible by advances in science and technology has led to a speed and rate of change that appears to be unique

in the history of man" (Barr). And the rate of change continued to accelerate. Around the turn of the century values also changed focus, no longer being centered about the group or community, but concentrating now on individual achievement. It was in fact a move to anonymity. At the same time immigration was on the increase, bringing large numbers of nationally minded groups together in crowded urban centers. Together the rapid social change, immigration, urbanization, and uncontrolled industrial growth had brought about a drastic alteration of the quality of life to be found in America.

Consequently, educators investigating and evaluating this more complex social situation felt that instruction in history alone would not provide the skills necessary to ensure the ability of the average citizen to adequately handle the types of problems and decision making that were apt to arise in this new social order. From 1913 to 1916 the Committee issued a number of preliminary reports. It became evident that social studies was to be the vehicle used to improve the quality of life, if not restore that quality, to what it had been prior to the acceleration of social change. It was to be the social studies, born out of the response to the social critics of the day -- the Sinclairs, or later the Stienbecks, that would replace what had been informally taught through socialization in "small town" America, with a course of studies designed to have as its final product an educated citizenry. The Committee of 1916 began to respond to these issue, proposing many reforms which were adopted and became the structure of the social studies today.

With this in mind, how might one approach the task of identifying some of the facets which make the field of social studies education unique? I believe that the one premise that all of the "Old Masters" of the field --

the founding fathers, so to speak, of the social studies movement might agree on, is that it is the task of the social studies to formally prepare an educated citizenry. That has always been its task, though there has from time-to-time been some disagreement as to what the final "product" was to look like. According to the deliberations of the Committee on Social Studies, the explicit purpose of the social studies was to develop good citizenship (though a definition of that term has never been universally agreed upon). One need to look at the emergence of the field to be able to determine whether the notion of "social service or social control" was dominant (Lybarger). If one looks closely at the past fifty or so years, research projects have again and again endeavored to give definition to the field, but not so narrowly as to set parameters that would inhibit the preparation of a citizenry able to deal with all dimensions of life in a democratic society. In looking to the roots of the field we can get some clues, largely based on the particular orientation of the practitioner doing the research, as to whether the aim of the social studies field was to prepare the student for social service or to control the individual. Or asked another way, "Do the social studies train citizens -- or subjects?" (Lybarger). Knowing there is disagreement, as evidenced by the so-called "three traditions" approach to social studies teaching, we would expect to find that social studies educators, from the time of the 1916 report of the Committee on Social Studies to the 1977 revised constitution of the National Council for the Social Studies, have asserted that the object of social studies is the development of good citizens (Lybarger). Keeping this in mind, I believe that identifying something of the unique character of the social studies becomes somewhat simpler.

It is the social studies, not English, or mathematics, or the

sciences, that prepares citizens for their role - that is directly responsible for the transmission of the cultural heritage of our society from one generation to the next. We, the social studies educators, have been entrusted with the preservation of democracy, our most treasured commodity. It is the social studies that has been charged with the task of preparing an educated citizenry, that most vital of ingredients if the ideas of Jefferson and the other framers of the Constitution are to come to their fullest fruition. It is in the social studies classrooms that the "Old Masters" -- no matter what their particular orientation --would acquire the skills necessary to control their own political destiny; to take an active role in their society.

It is in the social studies classrooms that the socialization process would take place, giving the individual the skills used in interpersonal relationships, and honing those skills in preparation for a lifetime of informed decision making. It should be noted that among the proposed reforms sought by the 1916 Committee, was a need to improve the problem solving abilities of students. It was here that a fine tuning of one's moral development could take place, as positions were defined and questioned, and the values that will ultimately guide a person's life were adopted as part of the character of the individual.

It is in the social studies classroom that the student learns the history of one's country and an appreciation of one's cultural heritage. The integration of the social sciences, of history, geography, political science, sociology, etc., gives the individual a rich and varied background with which to analyze the situations to be faced in the future, as well as an appreciation of what has taken placed in the past. As citizens look to their culture and make inevitable comparisons with other cultures, their

view will be enhanced, as well as their appreciation of the heritage of other cultures is also developed. And again, the decision making skills of the students are expanded, because they have been exposed to the social studies.

What is unique about the social studies is that no other area of the school curriculum has been entrusted with the preservation of a way of life -- our way of life. Mathematics, English, and the sciences will furnish the individual with skills needed to make a living. However, it is the skills acquired in the social studies -- the understanding of one's cultural heritage, the appreciation of the cultural pluralism of our country and of the world, the responsibility of being a citizen in a democracy, the interpersonal skills needed to cope with a diverse population -- that make for the complete person. It is through engagement in a well thought out and developed social studies curriculum that each student is afforded the opportunity to develop those skills necessary to actively pursue life in a democratic society.

It is the social studies, then, that stands charged with the task and responsibility of preparing students for their place in society. While there has never been a consensus reached regarding the standard or norm for the "good citizen," we can find references and support for the goal of citizenship education. In a definition offered some one hundred plus years ago Henry Carey defined social science, "as the study of man in his efforts for the maintenance and improvement of his condition" (Lybarger). Such efforts were further advanced with the founding of the American Social Science Association. It was one of their members, Horace Greely, "who first articulated the connection between the study of social science and what the Committee on Social Studies would call in 1916, 'the elements of

welfare'" (Lybarger). It was through the efforts of the American Social Science Association and other professional groups that ideas were promoted linking the social studies to the improvement of the welfare of society. In doing so it was felt that instruction in the social studies might be effective in lessening the consequences of many of the victims of social change - those who were least equipped to handle the rapid economic, political and social change that had become the hallmark of the times. For the members of the Committee on Social Studies, the problems faced by the victims of progress, the native American, the immigrant, and the poor, seemed to pose the same kind of problems that had been faced by the slaves, freed at the end of the Civil War.

For these observers, plans such as those developed at the Hampton Institute "appeared to offer a humanitarian way to help the less fortunate (Lybarger). Here too, we saw the development of programs that were concerned with advancing the social welfare. Programs that were developed and implemented with the express goal of helping the person become a better citizen, by satisfying their needs.

That a consensus agreement has never been reached regarding a proper direction for citizenship education -- social service versus social control -- is probably not important at this time. The uniqueness of the field may center on the Old Masters and founders struggle to keep abreast of the changes taking place in society and to incorporate these into the social studies program. As Merle Curti has put it, "I pointed out . . . the dominant trends and minor eddies in the American economy and society and the influence these shifting forces had on the social thinking of educational leaders" (Curti).

In trying to respond to the so-called student needs, the social

studies field has often fallen victim to the charge that it has included courses and subject matter not properly suited to the field. This is true, and may be a fault; however, it may also be a uniqueness, albeit a negative one, for as stated, ". . . it was often the parents, . . . who demanded that the schools teach good manners, hygiene, the home arts, safe driving. Too often the critics did not realize that in no country did the local community and parents have as great an influence on the schools as in America" (Curti).

We must remember that the field of social studies education is indeed unique, for it does in many ways control the future of the country through the preparation of future generations From the establishment of the National Council for the Social Studies in the mid 1920's one can see, ". . sociology, and economics could teach the rising generations to think more realistically about international as well as domestic problems and that the perspective and methods of history and the other social studies promised to equip the student with keener insight and discrimination" (Curti).

Society continues to change. On an almost daily basis, advancements in science and technology affect people's lives. In order to more successfully cope with these changes, people will have to be able to make effective decisions more rapidly than ever, and to do so with the confidence that they are making sound and informed judgments based on the information at hand. If society is to function as intended in the spirit of the Constitution, students will have to be made aware of their cultural heritage, know their social responsibilities, and acquire and practice the decision making skills necessary to make a lifetime commitment to be a good citizen. The true uniqueness of our field may have been most eloquently

stated by Bragaw and Hartoonian - "Social studies is the school-based subject with the best potential for helping students put their citizenship all together in preparation for a lifetime of holding 'the office of citizen'" (Brandt). The work of the newly formed National Commission on the Social Studies is truly special, because in defining the role of the social studies, and making recommendations for curriculum changes, this group has the opportunity to make the social studies a proactive, and not a reactive force in the student's life.

REFERENCES

Barr, Robert D. "The Changing Role of History in American Public Schools." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Purdue University, 1969.

Barr, Robert D., James L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis. The Nature of the Social Studies. Palm Springs, CA.: ETC Publications, 1978.

Barth, James L. "The Social Studies Curriculum: A Preparation for and Practice of Lifelong Citizenship. Bloomington, IN.: Viewpoints (Indiana Council for the Social Studies Newsletter). Vol. 15, No. 3, May, 1988.

Brandt, Ronald S. (Ed.) Content of the Curriculum: ASCD 1988 Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1988.

Curti, Merle. The Social Ideas of American Educators. Paterson, N.J.: Littlefield, Adams and Co., 1963.

Lybarger, Michael. "Origins of the Social Studies Curriculum: 1865-1916." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. University of Wisconsin - Madison, 1981.

SOCIAL STUDIES FOUNDATIONS: A BRIEF VIEW OF THE SOCIAL EDUCATION DEBATE, C. 1910'S

David Warren Saxe

The University of Oklahoma

The original social studies prototype is an example of a mechanism that responds to change. The prototype as well as the context out of which it developed merit our careful consideration. We must be educational thinkers, not tinkers, being ever mindful not only of where we are and where we hope to go, but also aware of the trail that has been blazed for us.

Today there are certain voices in our society that would have the school curricula "return" to a more historically minded program.[1] That is, return to a curricula predating the formulation of the social studies that reflects a strengthening of what might be labeled a basic foundational approach. A return to a curricula that includes emphasis on what are touted as basic American values, such as , the work ethic and respect for authority. Also highlighted in this "return" are such ideas as increasing the breath and depth of history subjects, particularly American history together with a dramatic increase of geographical awareness of not only America but the world beyond. If a "historically minded" direction is where thoughtful educational leaders would like to take us, it is important to be aware that the social studies framers rejected historically centered studies in favor of a what was viewed as a more socially responsible approach.

This essay has two basic aims: (1) to present a conspectus of the social education debate that immediately preceded the dissemination of what came to be the final report of the Committee on Social Studies; and (2) to outline the unique elements of that committee's social education

experiment. To avoid the seemingly ahistorical outlook so common in regard to the foundations of the social studies, it is hoped that this paper will provide a historical perspective for those presently engaged in curricular examinations.

By 1912, despite the report of the American Historical Association's Committee of Five (McLaughlin, 1912) that confirmed the informational focus of history instruction, a movement to reorganize secondary education under the socialization banner, indeed all public schooling, was well underway. As one contemporary noted, on one hand, although "a new sun of hope dawned upon the educational world," the movement represented a "plunge into the wilderness (Bagley, 1911, p. 207)."

Between the end of the century and the election of Woodrow Wilson people interested in education articulated a continued plea for reconceptualizing the prevailing means and ends of public schooling. Among these individuals Clarence Kingsley (1910), a former secondary mathematics teacher, who was eager to activate the interests of educators, circulated a report among the membership of the National Education Association.

The attention this report generated was considerable as the N.E.A.'s Department of Secondary Education promptly called together the Committee on Articulation of High Schools and Colleges to investigate and report on this topic (Krug, 1964). Later, under Kingsley's direction, the Committee expanded their numbers to include several sub-committees from the various fields of study in the secondary schools. This expanded Committee was reformed in 1913 and renamed the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (Kingsley, 1918). One of the original sub-committees of the Commission was the Committee on Social Science, which was later retitled the Committee on Social Studies (Dunn, 1913, 1916) after Thomas

Jesse Jones became its chairman. This subtle shift, from social science to social studies, launched the social education movement in American public schools.

If popular opinion supported the actions of the Committee of Five in 1910, in that, it was said that school officials endorsed non-socializing, information based history teaching, within a few years something had radically altered that perception. By 1913, those that favored direct "enlightenment" approaches in education were viewed to be in the minority. In its place, socialized education, citizenship training, social efficiency, social responsibility, and social progress, as education concepts, had gained favor and currency among educational leaders.

The progressive campaign, emerging out of the literature of psychology, the social sciences, and philosophy, sought to "re-educate" school leaders to adopt these newer concepts and to reject what they felt was a strictly academic program. It was then that the traditional history curriculum was targeted for replacement. Ironically, the insurgents determined that the old-style traditional history teachers of the secondary schools should lead the social education agenda into the future.

The voices for school efficiency and social progress began to emerge in popular school literature after 1900 and reached a "mania" level by 1912. For instance, Elmer Ellsworth Brown's text for secondary teachers, The Making of Our Middle Schools, mentioned that schools in 1901 were promoting a new outlook. Here, Brown included John Dewey's revolutionary concept "the school is not preparation for life; it is life" as being the "keynote of current educational thought (1902, p. 436)." Brown also spoke of the improvement of the "educational efficiency of the secondary schools," as part of the new outlook in secondary education (1902, p. 461).

Ostensibly, by 1912, pre-service teacher textbooks in general education were completely given over to the new theories of education and learning. The notion of school efficiency and addressing the needs of students were, at least in the educational textbook media, thoroughly entrenched. Writing for new education students, Edward Lee Thorndike, of Teachers College, Columbia, noted,

> One of the most important changes that are taking place in our country's schools is their rapid acceptance of duties other than there mere instruction of children.... The school system of a community is becoming an agency ready to act for the community's welfare in almost any way.... Its teachers are trying to cooperate with all forces for betterment; its aims are becoming those of education in the widest sense -- to make all me want what is good, and to get for all men the goods they deserve (1912, p. 273).

Historians were not immune to the social efficiency movement and many saw the need to look introspectively into their own program. Frederick Jackson Turner's, presidential address (1910) to the membership of the American Historical Association, outlined the pervading theme of the day, rapid change. Turner's speech gave considerable attention to the need for reexamination and restatement. For mainline historians, the issue was to maintain the old order despite the seemingly uncontrolled conditions of change or to reshape the old guard values to reflect the new dynamics of democracy. In regard to the public schools, historians did make an attempt at reexamination with their Committee of Five report that evaluated the status of history instruction written, ostensibly, under the mandate of the older Committee of Seven.

Although social studies historians have claimed that the Five's report exerted little impact upon the schools largely because it basically confirmed the bulk of the report of the Seven, it was, in fact, the high water mark of the traditional history curriculum.[2] Its value and

importance in curricular history was that it was ineffective. That is, it was not what the Five did that was memorable, it was what they did not do that should garner attention. Essentially, the Five's adherence to the Seven's report cleared the last obstacle for the social education advocates, and, in effect, ended the locus of curricular control among academic historians.

To the social education insurgents, historians were given the opportunity to bring the traditional history curriculum into the twentieth century, to revise the program to reflect the new demands of education; but they failed. This failure confirmed their mandate for change. Unfortunately, for their sake, feeling that they stood on the solid ground of public opinion, as supported by their own survey as well as others (MacDonald, 1907), the Five maintained the intellectually based traditional history program of the Committee of Seven (Mc Laughlin, 1899). Entrenched in a relatively fixed position, secured by the alleged support of the field's practitioners (Claxton, 1912; Bagley and Rugg, 1916; Gold, 1917; Koos, 1917; Tryon, 1917) traditional historians drew their line in the curricular sand and made their stand. Concurrently, the advocates for social efficiency and responsibility marshalled their forces.

Evidently, educators were well aware things were coming to a head in public education. Most, if not all, criticisms articulated in the various surveys were directly related to the swelling opposition to the traditional system of education that favored a school reorganization, particularly at the secondary level. Yet what sort of reorganization and how much the school curricula would change, wasn't clear. Notwithstanding any uncertainties, the Commissioner of Education's 1912 (Claxton) survey reported,

> Much is said and written nowadays of the school's inefficiency; one hears, too, a great deal of increasing its efficiency. Thus from both points of view the impression is given that something is wrong with the American school, that at least there is room for salutary changes. In the opinion of even the least critical, much remains to be done to perfect our school system. The chief count in the indictment against the school is that it is not meeting the needs of the community, and various panaceas for this ill have made their appearance. "Enrichment" of the curriculum, "socializing" the school, and industrial training are some of the "movements" of which one has often heard or read.... Some see in a complete reorganization of the school system the only effectual means of readjustment. But whatever may be the need or however great it may be, there is in some quarters a tendency to make radical changes in the organization and work of the city school (1912, p. 129).

Although the Survey discussed the principal educational problems of the day, it remained decidedly conservative. Yet nothing was of more profound consequence for American schools than an official document of the United States government, issued by a cabinet level organization suggesting that the Federal Government make the education system an agency of the State. "It is simply that the State," noted the Survey, "in its eagerness to allow the maximum of local self-government, has been reluctant to insist upon education as a State function. The first step in educational progress is recognition by the state of its direct school obligations (p. 11)."

In the effort to meet its perceived obligations, it was necessary for the government to organize the various criticisms of education into a viable position. It was not to be necessarily an argument <u>against</u> the traditional or prevailing system of education, but certainly a plea <u>for</u> a more socially responsible system. The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education was, in essence a response to the argument against traditional education, with the Committee on Social Studies providing the central core of studies for the "new education." Although the Committee on Social Studies operated under the auspices of a government agency, social service (as opposed to social control), at least initially, appeared to

drive their efforts.[3]

Led by Thomas Jesse Jones, by 1913, the social education insurgents took the initiative to bring the history curriculum in line with the push for more socially efficient and responsible schools. The social education agenda had four basic objectives: (1) debunk traditional history; (2) argue for the ouster of traditional history from the curriculum; (3) develop and disseminate a social education proposal; and (4) argue for the placement of a social education prototype at the expense of traditional history programs (Saxe, 1988).

With this agenda for change, new interests were being served by the 1916 Committee's adoption of a fresh line of philosophy. The major concern of the committee was to prepare and present a program to expedite social efficiency in an era were school officials were taken in and consumed with the "cult of efficiency (Callahan, 1962)." The 1916 Social Studies Committee membership was no exception. They envisioned their curriculum as an integral part and major step toward the development of a viable progressive education program for secondary schools.

The Social Studies Committee grounded its own argument for reform in a unique combination, or formulation of three key variables wherein developmental psychology was represented by the Committee's interest in the developing individual, scientific methodology was reflected in their demand for truth and objectivity, and sociology served the needs of a dynamic structure. As cited in the text of the Committee report as well as in the preface of Arthur William Dunn's influential civic text (1906), the major acknowledged source for the assertion that the individual and society are inextricably bound together was Dewey's essay, "Ethical Principles Underlying Education (Dewey, 1897)." Ostensibly, the Committee attempted

at address both individual and social concerns, however,, they were very clear that the "common interest" or "social aspect" of the social studies program was to take precedence of any individual concern. In a sense, the Committee's socio-psychological-scientific fusion underlined the aim and spirit of the progressive school movement that claimed the good citizen and social efficiency as its ultimate educational goals.

In what Shirley Engle and Anna Ochoa (1988) have labeled socialization and countersocialization, the teaching of traditional values were incorporated in the recommendations for history instruction that emphasized great institutions, great men, and great ideas selected from our near or distant past and the notions of experimentation and free discussion of social problems were represented in the proposal for community civics and the Problems of American Democracy course (to be guided by reflective thinking). The Committee encouraged teachers to help their students study the problems of their society (school, community, state, and nation), however, all instruction was to stem from an interpretation of what the immediate needs and/or interests as well as social problems suitable for classroom study were. Again, teachers were to apply the guiding principle that all needs, interests, and social problems were to be viewed in terms of the collective or common good.

In our present curricular circles, an attack has been launched on the "use of 'skills-oriented,' 'relevant' materials in elementary and secondary grades" that have been accused of causing the decline of "traditional history, myth, and literature (Hirsch, Kett, and Trefil, 1988)." In effect, the attack has been reversed. The historically minded camp is calling upon the social studies advocates to clean up their act or step aside. And, as in the first debate, ironically, the neotraditionalists are

calling upon the social studies practitioners to fulfill their program.

In the 1910's the battle cry was "social efficiency" and "social responsibility." Now the cry is "cultural; literacy."[4] As we approach our curricular decisions, the historic debate between the forces of traditional history and the social education insurgents may shed a great deal of light on our problems. Present social studies advocates would not, it would appear, discount the need for historical and geographical emphasis. We must, however, try to prevent such work from becoming mere informational studies par excellence. That is, to avoid the mistake of appearing to foster only the filling of heads with so much unrelated factual palaver in the name of "cultural literacy."

As noted in the first social education prototype, it is within the scope of the social studies to deal with foundational level studies and it is also within the scope of the social studies to handle other forms of exchange. It is not simply that we add this much more to the recipe for good citizenship, or that we can merely substitute foundational studies for such unique social studies conceptualizations and models that have evolved out of the original social education prototype, such as, inquiry approaches, decision making, and reflective thinking (or that even the reverse can hold).

The original social studies prototype is an example of a mechanism that responds to change. The prototype as well as the context out of which it developed merits our careful consideration. We must be educational thinkers not tinkers being ever mindful not only of where we are and where we hope to go, but also aware of the trail that has been blazed for us.

ENDNOTES

1. Among the leading advocates of a more historically centered curricula are E. D. Hirsch, Jr., Lynne Chenney, Diane Ravitch, Chester Finn, and

William Bennett. See also the final report of the 1988 Bradley Commission on History in the Schools: Gagnon, Paul (1988, November). Why Study History. The Atlantic Monthly. pp. 43-46; and Gifford, Dernard et al. (1988). History in the Schools. New York: Macmillan.

2. See Johnson, Henry. (1916, 1940). The Teaching of History in Elementary and Secondary Schools. New York: Macmillan; Tryon, Rolla. (1935). The Social Sciences As School Subjects. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; and Wesley, Edgar Bruce. (1937). Teaching the Social Stduies. New York: D. C. Heath.

3. For discussion of social service/social control consult works of authors such as Cleo Cherryholmes, Michael Katz, Clarence Karrier, Michael Young, David Snedden, Michael Lybarger, and Henry Giroux.

4. Cultural Literacy has become so popular, that between the publication of Hirsch's first book Cultural Literacy (1987) and his Dictionary of Cultural Literacy (1988) Houghton Mifflin (the publisher) has sought and been granted a United States trademark for the term.

REFERENCES

Bagley, W.C. and Rugg, H.O. (1916, August 21). Content of American History As Taught in the Seventh and Eighth Grades. University of Illinois School of Education Bulletin No. 16, XIII, No. 51.

Bagley, W.C. (1911). Craftsmanship in Teaching. New York: Macmillan.

Brown, E.E. (1902). The Making of Our Middle School An Account of the Development of Secondary Education in the United States. New York: Longsmam, Green.

Callahan, R. (1962). Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Claxton, P.P. (1913). Report of the Commissioner of Education For the Year Ending June 30, 1912, I. Washington, D.C.: GPO

Dewey, J. (1897) Ethical Principles Underlying Education. National Herbart Society Third Yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp. 7-34.

Dunn, A.W. (1906). The Community and the Citizen. Indianapolis: Echo Press.

Dunn, A.W. (1913, 1916). The Social Studies in Secondary Education. zreport of the Committee on Social Studies of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, National Education Association, United States Bureau of Education, Bulletins, 1913, No. 41, and 1916, No. 28. Washington, D.C.: GPO.

Engle, S.,and Ochoa, A.S. (1988). Education for Democratic Decision Making in Social Studies. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gold, H.H. (1917, February, March, April) Methods and Content of Courses in History in the High Schools of the United States. School Review. XXV, No. 2. 88-100; XXV, No. 3. 187-195; and XXV, No. 4. 274-282.

Hirsch, E.D. Jr., Kett, J.F. & Trefil, J. (1988) The Dictionary of Cultural Literacy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. p.xiv.

Kingsley, C. (1918). Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. report of the Subject Committeess of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association. United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1918, No. 35. Washington, D.C.: GPO.

Kingsley, C. (1910). report of Committee on Conference with tthe Colleges. Yearbook of the High School Teachers Association of New York City 1909-1910. New York: NEA.

Koos, L.V. (1917) The Administration of Secondary-School Units. Supplementary Educational Monographs, I, No. 8. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Krug, E.A. (1964). The Shaping of the American High School, I. New York: Harper and Row.

MacDonald, W. (1907, September 12) The Situation of History in Secondary Schools. The Nation, 85, No. 2202. 225-226.

McLaughlin, A., Haskins, C., Mann, C., Sullivan, J., and Robinson, J.H. (1912). The Study of History in Schools. Report of the Committee of Five to the American Historical Association. New York: Macmillan.

Saxe, D.W. (1988) Introduction to the Context and Prototype of the Social Studies. Unpublished manuscript.

Thorndike, E.L. (1912). Education A First Book. New York: Macmillan.

Tryon, R.M. (1917). A Brief Review of the Current Literature Relating to History and the Teaching of History in Junior and Senior High Schools. The School Review. XXV, No. 9. 684-689.

Tyrner, F.J. (1911, January). American Historical Association Meetings. The History Teachers' Magazine. II, No. 5.

SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION: ROOTS THAT REMAIN FUNDAMENTAL

Susanne M. Shafer

Arizona State University

...goals of social studies education appear as appropriate today as they did back in the 1930's. Their urgency is validated by such distorted social phenomena as drug consumption, crime and violence, divorce and single parenthood, and teenage suicide. To enable social studies teachers to implement these goals, however, demands support and assistance on the part of the educational establishment.

I. INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of the 20th century immigration into the United States from diverse countries reached an apex, or more than a million persons a year. At the same time industrialization and urbanization convinced many that a carefully crafted education was an essential vehicle for the appropriate socialization of youth for work, family and civic life. This realization sparked the growth of the progressive education movement. That movement was being implemented in many schools by the 1920's.

Simultaneously, in 1918 the Commission on Secondary Education of the National Education Association articulated the goals of secondary education in its statement of the Seven Cardinal Principles. Education should now aim to prepare students for health, command of the fundamental processes, vocation, citizenship, home membership, leisure, and ethical character. Serving as a directive to the schools to guide them in the Americanization of the immigrants' children, the Seven Cardinal Principles also redefined the secondary school curriculum, given the even broader representation of American youth entering our high schools.

The advocates of progressive education and those directly responsible

for our high schools agreed that effective citizenship by then was no longer to be attained by a simple inculcation of historical and geographic knowledge but by a broader utilization of the several social sciences and by direct experiences with democracy in the school and in the community. Active learning emanating in part from the students' own questions was urged. The subject social studies emerged, with civic education being a major objective. Thereafter, two events in the 1930's served to sharpen its definition and role, namely (1) the search for amelioration of the Depression and (2) the rise of Adolf Hitler in Germany. Social studies appeared to be the answer both as a philosophy and a methodology of education.

II. THE THEORETICAL BASIS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION IN THE 1930'S

By 1930 John Dewey's philosophy had permeated much of the American educational establishment. Because Dewey delineated a close bond between the school and social concerns of American democracy, social studies educators found his work particularly applicable. Instead of a methodical recital of historical dates and events and geographic places and facts to be committed to memory by their students, teachers were encouraged to make social studies a subject with immediate applications and practical utility. Dewey's stress on amelioration through communal responsibilities for students in their schools, through reliance on the scientific method, and through dispassionate explorations of their wider world transformed social studies education.

Educational Philosophers

William H. Kilpatrick -- The reconstructionist aspect of John Dewey's philosophy was expanded upon by William Heard Kilpatrick, George Counts, Harold Rugg, and Carleton Washburne among others. Kilpatrick took Dewey's

call for the application of intelligence, or reflective thinking, and the scientific method of inquiry to probe and analyze life and devised the 'project method' (Kilpatrick, 1918, pp. 319-335). "The schools," he said, "must educate for intelligently directed social change..." (Kilpatrick, 1932, p. 60). They must teach the pupils "...to wish the common good and seek it in season and out ..." (Kilpatrick, 1932, p. 60). School projects should engage students in socially useful activities. "There should be definite effort to broaden and enrich the social interests of the pupils," according to Kilpatrick (Kilpatrick, 1932, p. 61.). He also warned against indoctrination and the determination of social status on the basis of an individual's formal education. "...The acceptance of social responsibility and the development of social intelligence ..." should be the goal of social studies eductaion (Kilpatrick, 1932, p. 85).

Harold Rugg -- Kilpatrick favored his Teachers College colleague Harold Rugg's demand "...that the task of social reconstruction is essentially educational reconstruction. The school must become a dynamic agency of social regeneration" where the interdependence of the individual's development and goals and those of the society are accepted without hesitation (Gross and Chandler, p. 382).

George S. Counts -- Sharply critical of the progressive education movement as having "... elaborated no theory of social welfare, unless it be that of anarchy or extreme individualism," Counts in his volume Dare The Schools Build A New Social Order? urged educators to veer away from the child-centered school and disregard contemporary issues. Instead, he argued, schools should become intent on social improvements, the urgency for which those dark Depression days of 1932 easily demonstrated (Counts, p. 7). Among the popularly accepted fallacies in education which Counts

enumerated, he listed that the schools could be impartial, when in fact it "...must shape attitudes, develop tastes, and even impose ideas " (Counts, p. 19). He warned that "until school and society are bound together by a common purpose, the program of education will lack both meaning and vitality" (Counts, p. 17). Nor did Counts accept the notion that schools should primarily educate students to adjust to social change. Such passive acceptance he found both anarchic and irrational.

Boyd H. Bode -- While Dewey, Kilpatrick, Rugg, Counts and others expounded on progressive education at Teachers College, Columbia University, Boyd H. Bode pursued a similar line of reasoning in his philosophy of education classes at Ohio State University. He, too, proposed that "education must fit the individual to reorganize his world" (Cremin, p. 223). Bode cautioned against excessive individualization in classrooms and overdependence on the project method as vibrant, productive curriculum arrangement. The road to real democracy demanded a social and educational philosophy in keeping with the political assumptions of that democracy.

Educational Practitioners

The 1930's not only witnessed the clear exposition of progressivism at major American teacher education institutions but also model schools demonstrated in practice the effectiveness of Dewey's ideas. Among these were public and private schools as well as the laboratory schools at a number of colleges of education.

Helen Parkhurst -- When Helen Parkhurst founded the Dalton School in 1916, she sought to put into practice Dewey's principles of education. Both the student's intellectual growth and participation in group living were taken into account as Parkhurst developed the Dalton Laboratory Plan.

While she recognized that learning was an individual matter, she also thought the development of "...a social consciousness [to be] the prelude to that social experience so indispensable as a preparation for manhood and womanhood" (Gross and Chandler, p. 441).

Carleton Washburne -- As longtime superintendent of the Winnetka, Illinois Public Schools, Carleton Washburne inaugurated a program of core subjects, namely language arts, mathematics, the sciences, and social studies, in which students proceeded at their own pace through the planned lessons. In addition, students engaged in self-expressive work and took part in "...group projects revolving around the community life of the school" (Cremin, p. 297). By means of the latter Washburne aimed to have students "...grow in the consciousness of social unity and interdependence" while individual work would permit children to be "....recognized as individuals, allowed to progress and develop at their own rates" (Washburne and Stearns, p. 174).

Eight Year Study -- As high school attendance rose in the 1930's but traditionalism persisted there, the Progressive Education Association conceived a grandiose scheme of revitalization known as the Eight Year Study. Thirty private and public high schools across the United States volunteered to have their faculties devise a curriculum in keeping with the progressive philosophy of education. Colleges agreed to accept the graduates of these programs even if they had not fulfilled the specified subject entrance requirements. In time college students from the participating high schools were matched against others who had presented traditional college entrance qualifications (Aiken, passim). Among the differences found favoring the graduates of the thirty participating schools were their slightly higher grade averages in college, a higher

degree of intellectual curiosity and drive, greater precision and objectivity in their thinking, their greater participation in organized student groups, and a more active concern with national and world affairs (Cremin, p. 256). These strengths were identical with the goals of progressive education.

Educational Policies Commission -- In a 1938 statement issued by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, civic responsibility appeared as one of the four goals of education along with self-realization, human relationships, and economic efficiency. The Commission speaking for its broad membership of teachers and educational administrators, enumerated among the objectives of civic responsibility, social justice, social activity, social understanding, critical judgment, tolerance, conservation, social applications of science, world citizenship, law observance, economic literacy, political citizenship, and devotion to democracy (Brown, p. 62). A similar reiteration of key goals of education issued in 1944 continued to reflect the Commission's acceptance of the philosophy of progressive education and the centrality, in their thinking, of social studies, especially citizenship education (Gross and Chandler, p. 405).

III. LANDMARK DEFINITIONS OF CIVIC EDUCATION

Civic education as well as the response of education to social change were the focus of a number of educational inquiries conducted during the Depression days of the 1930's. They were initiated by (1) the American Historical Association (1929-33), (2) the Regents of the State of New York (1935-38), and (3) the Progressive Education Association (1932-38). The Stanford University School of Education held a major conference to assess social education in 1938.

American Historical Association

The Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools was appointed by the Council of the American Historical Association in 1928. Its charge was to provide a standard for social studies education, including objectives, content, and methodology. It divided its work into "...(a) philosophy, purpose, and objectives; (b) materials of instruction; (c) methods of teaching; (d) tests and testing; (e) the teacher; and (f) public relations" (Krey, p. 155). Its membership included social scientists, historians, teacher educators, and educational administrators. The work of the Commission appeared in a series of volumes starting with the Charles A. Beard A Charter for the Social Sciences and including the final report, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission.

A Charter for the Social Sciences -- From the outset, A Charter focused on the social sciences in the school curriculum. Scholarship, the realities of the society in which instruction occurred, and the requirements of the teaching-learning process must at all times guide the curriculum based on the social sciences, according to Beard. Scholarship implied scientifically acceptable verification as well as criticism even when the latter ran counter to popularly accepted perceptions.

Among the realities from which instruction was to be derived were the delineations of the world presented in the several social sciences. Another reality impinging on social studies and civic education was the changing nature of society. Any rigid freezing of objectives to be achieved in social studies contradicted the changing economic and social demands emanating from the expanding technology in American society. A third reality was the nature of American government.

> American government depends for its operation as well as its vitality upon discussion, criticism, and the formation of public opinion. And

> in this process the boys and girls who go out from our schools do not participate as mere robots, doing what they are told to do (Beard, 1932, p. 37).

Neither innocuous generalizations nor an avoidance of controversial issues hid from students the realities of life around them. "...A program of social studies must reassert the significance of criticism and inventiveness as a potent force for progress and a condition precedent to survival (Beard, 1932, p. 112). Civic instruction in the United States must of necessity lay stress on the democratic process of government. It must draw the students' attention to America's part in world affairs. The context within which civic instruction should occur was one that neither viewed present conditions as satisfactory nor sought a utopian future but instead relied on continuous critique, innovations, and choices to ever improve society. The American Constitution, according to the Commission, clearly reflected that position when it spoke of government promoting the general welfare, liberty and justice (Beard, 1932, p. 58). Social studies should find its direction from these very goals. The fundamental purpose of civic education, Beard wrote, "is the creation of rich, many-sided personalities, equipped with practical knowledge and inspired by ideals so that they can make their way and fulfill their mission in a changing society which is a part of a world complex" (Beard, 1932, p. 96). The ideal citizens would have a deep loyalty to America, "... an appreciation of its achievements, and faith in its power, [which] are indispensable to defense against attacks from without and to the promotion of the good life within" (Beard, 1932, p. 105). They would be able to acquire knowledge and to weigh information. They would develop ethical and aesthetic sensitivities. To all these capacities the social sciences were to contribute, according to Charter.

Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission -- the final document to emerge from the American Historical Association's Commission on the Social Studies in Schools, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission, laid out the majority of the members' views of the goals of social studies as well as the mean by which the goals were to be attained. While they echoed much of what earlier had appeared in the Charter, they went beyond it in their references to the collective good of society and socially useful initiatives to alleviate economic and social ills. The conclusions and recommendations' frame of reference specified (1) that "the main function of the social sciences [was] the acquisition of accurate knowledge of, and informed insight into man and society; that of social science instruction [was] the transmission of such knowledge and insight, with attendant skills and loyalties, to the individuals composing society," (Krey, p. 7) and (2) that the ideals of popular democracy, personal liberty, and the government's promotion of the general welfare were fundamental to American society.

Interracial and intercultural understanding were identified by the Commission as means by which to facilitate the resolution of economic problems and differences. "Nationalism should be infused with enlightenment, reason, and tolerance" (Krey, p. 26). The application of scientific analysis to social inquiry rounded out the recommended frame of reference for social studies in the schools.

> The Commission deemed desirable, continued and unremitting emphasis on the spirit of science and scholarship, liberty of thought and expression, freedom of press and platform, and tolerant study and consideration of the most diverse ideas, domestic and foreign, modern, medieval, and ancient, as the chief means of defense against the tyranny of bureaucracy, of narrow nationalism, and of brutal uninformed power (Krey, p. 26).

Accepting the notion that education constituted a form of social

action and reflected the culture and philosophy of its progenitors, the Commission pointed out that, "...the formulation of a relevant and effective educational philosophy for a particular society at a particular time and place in history, must rest in large measure upon the findings of the social sciences, findings pertaining to the nature, trends, and thought of that society in its regional and world setting" (Krey, p. 32).

> The supreme purpose of education in the United States, in addition to the development of rich and many-sided personalities, is the preparation of the rising generation to enter the society now coming into being through thought, ideal, and knowledge, rather than through coercion, regimentation, and ignorance, and to shape the form of that society in accordance with American ideals of popular democracy and personal liberty and dignity (Krey, p. 39).

The Commission did not propose a specific curriculum design, but they did stress the inclusion of the social sciences for current data on issues of the day and the use of history to show the development of the democratic heritage as well as the rise of industrialism and of economic planning on a national scale in America (Krey, p. 52). Teachers of social studies needed to be knowledgeable in the social sciences and in their contribution to the students' education and later life as well as in the abundant strategies possible to enhance the teaching - learning process in the social studies. A competent, enthusiastic teacher, according to the Commission would use the community as a social laboratory; he would use small groups in class; he would recognize and cherish individual differences while teaching cooperation as a social necessity; and he would "...endeavor to acquaint the pupil with diverse ideas and points of view and cultivate in him a reasoned skepticism regarding the claims advanced in support of any social doctrine or program" (Krey, p. 83). The same teacher would also use a variety of resources. "Observation and discussion should be coupled with actual participation (by students] in organization

and conduct of the life of the school and in all socially useful activities in the community that can be coordinated with the work of the school..." (Krey, p. 58). Since much of what the social studies teachers aim to achieve did not fit into the near mathematical mold utilized by the new breed of testmakers of the 1930's, the Commission expressed grave reservations about the use of these tests as a means of evaluation in the social studies.

Altogether, the Commission's Conclusions and Recommendations provided clear guidelines to philosophy, objectives, curriculum, methodology, administration, and teacher preparation, and role for social studies in schools. In their own volumes some of the members developed some aspects further. Charles Beard in The Nature of the Social Sciences explained how each of them related to the objectives of the social studies (Beard, 1934, passim). Charles E. Merriam state in his Civic Education in the United States that the objectives of civic instruction should be not only a transmission of civic knowledge but the teaching of a range of political behaviors and a comprehension of the social context of political issues and the effect of one behavior or another on different social groups (Merriam, 1931, p. 361). Particularly in view of social and economic changes and an expanding role of governments, these skills and understandings would gain in importance.

Merriam's work and that of the other members of the Commission on the Social Studies of The American Historical Association constituted an optimistic educational response to the 1930's, a period of economic depression, the New Deal, and the onset of totalitarianism. Civic education directed toward the propagation of the fundamental beliefs of American Democracy, based on the social sciences along with history, and

posited on the scientific method and on the Deweyan principle of learning by doing, especially in the school's community, would prepare youth to deal effectively with contemporary economic, political, and social problems in the spirit of that democracy.

New York State Regents' Inquiry

The second major document on social studies education to emerge in the 1930's was the volume Education for Citizenship (Wilson, passim), a description of a study of social studies instruction in New York State. The inquiry was undertaken because the adequacy of the existing program in the social studies was also being seriously questioned. Conducted in 1936 and 1937, the study consisted of (1) the testing of secondary school students knowledge and social competence using standardized tests, and (2) an examination of "...school practices in order to discover which practices seem to facilitate and which to interfere with the attainment of competence" (Wilson, p. 8). Sixty-two schools were selected to provide a representative sample of New York State's secondary schools. The Regents' sponsored study was based on the assumption "...that the basic objective of general education is a degree of social competence which will enable pupils to participate not only harmlessly but constructively in the operations of society" (Wilson, p. 5). Civic competence in America's democratic society, the basic objective of secondary education, implied the "...ability of students to enter into obligations of membership in a complex and dynamic group, both in its political and broadly social aspects" (Wilson, p. 5). The social studies made up of history, geography, and the newer social sciences taught students to link thought and action in civic affairs and to identify social deficiencies and their possible remedies. Social studies should produce in pupils greater social

competence, according to those who designed the Regents' Inquiry into citizenship education.

The study sought evidence of civic competence, specifically pupils' font (1) of socially useful information drawn from civics, American history, contemporary affairs, and their communities, (2) of concepts and understandings basic to social action, of useful skills of study and thought, and of attitudes affecting group action (Wilson, p. 20). In addition, test results were related to I.Q., socio-economic background, sex, and types of community. The social studies curriculum, the work of social studies teachers, and instructional materials used were analyzed, as was the relationship of the social studies program in each school to its client community.

The conclusions drawn revealed the importance assigned to different objectives in social studies education. While these New York State students knew more about current events than their peers elsewhere in the United States, (Wilson, p. 40.) they showed greater variability and little increase in knowledge of American history of current events for the 9th to 12th grade (Wilson, p. 84). "On tests of information about their local communities pupils were lamentably ignorant or misinformed " (Wilson, p. 87). "On tests of attitudes involving race, politics, national and international matters, pupils were generally fairly liberal," (Wilson, p. 87.) and they tended to give verbal allegiance to the democratic fundamentals of free speech and free assemblage, an attitude which intensified as they reached their senior year (Wilson, p. 87). They saw "...little relation between their instruction in social studies and their own reactions in socio-civic situations" (Wilson, p. 107).

That history was "...emphasized at the expense of the other social

sciences..." (Wilson, p. 129). and that American history was studies three times from 1st to 12th grade was in part to blames, according to the study, as was the narrowed curriculum focus derived from the teachers; interpretation of the state social studies syllabus and their anticipation of the questions posed in the statewide Regents' examinations. Teachers themselves critiques the social studies curriculum.

> "...The curriculum does not adequately reflect the various fields of social sciences; it is too predominantly historical, its economics is too theoretical; social processes and phenomena are neglected; current events, though widely taught, are often merely superficial" (Wilson, p. 157).

Teachers too often themselves failed to provide instruction that drew students into state recommended classroom discussion, "socialized recitation," or project work for fear of not covering the topics in the state syllabus (Wilson, p. 196). Teachers instead tended to focus on information giving and to neglect attitude and skills formation.

Education for Citizenship, the Report of the Regents' Inquiry, used student achievement and an analysis of teaching practices as base data from which to propose a program of reform of social studies education.

Progressive Education Association

In 1932 the Progressive Education Association established the Commission on Secondary Curriculum, one of whose subcommittees focused on the function of social studies in general education. "Its membership ... included specialists in the social sciences, teachers of the social studies in secondary schools and colleges, and students of educational theory and practice" (Progressive Education Association, p. VII). Throughout, the report produced by the committee gave primary consideration to the point of view of the teacher of the social studies. A number of assumptions undergirded its report.

1. Democracy is a way of life which respects the unique worth of the individual, which is sensitive to the significance of relationships between individuals, and which has faith in reason and reasonableness as the major tools for meeting the problems arising within these relationships (Progressive Education Association, p. 11).

2. The ultimate goal of education is to meet the needs of individuals in the basic aspects of living in such a way as to promote the fullest possible realization of personal potentialities and the most effective participation in a democratic society (Progressive Education Association, p. 14).

3. A program of democratic general education ... must be kept flexible in order to meet the changing needs of individuals and the changing demands of the social order (Progressive Education Association, p. 15).

4. ...Since democracy rests ultimately upon the intelligence of the common man, the student must himself be given increasing responsibility for reconstructing his own beliefs, attitudes, and plans of action through the exercise of his own maturing intelligence. He must, therefore, have a responsible share in planning his own education (Progressive Education Association, p. 15).

5. [Since] research shows that adolescents become active as a result of felt needs; that they act as physical-emotional wholes; and that their actions are controlled by the values they hold dear, (Progressive Education Association, p. 23.) [they] must be provided with opportunities for making ... choices wisely, for gaining the attitudes and skills necessary for coping effectively with heterogeneity and change (Progressive Education Association, p. 20).

The committee specified "...the function of the social studies teacher [to be] to use the resources of the social sciences in meeting adolescent needs so as to develop the desirable characteristics of behavior essential to the achievement of democratic values within the realities of the changing American culture" (Progressive Education Association, p. 23). They, too, in other words stressed that social studies education in a democracy meant preparation for change, for active citizenship, and for individual decision making. To fulfill his function, the social studies teacher needs to be knowledgeable in the social sciences, to understand the dynamics of adolescent growth, to respect the dignity of each individual,

and to appreciate the rights of free speech, rational inquiry, and other democratic values, especially as these were being tested in America's modern industrial society. The committee provided the social studies teacher with a plethora of suggestions on how to proceed in his classroom given the goals delineated in the committee's report.

> The social studies teacher should aid the adolescent, not only in understanding and assuming loyalties to groups, the nation, and humanity, but also in setting up criteria for choice among his loyalties (Progressive Education Association, p. 166).

To understand social processes student should be asked to study social conditions and social interaction in the community. They should study the evidence of social change in Western societies and in the United States specifically. The aim should be to enhance the students' social sensitivity, tolerance of differences, readiness for cooperative activities, and sense of social-civic efficacy. Writing in the late 1930's when Hitler was spitting his propaganda at the whole world, the committee urged that students be taught to analyze and to critique propaganda techniques (Progressive Education Association, p. 173). In addition, the committee explained the need for students "... to select effective leaders, to evaluate competence in leadership; and to act as a leader themselves whenever by doing so they might further social-civic welfare " (Progressive Education Association, p. 160). Basic economic concepts should also be taught, for one thing, to enable students eventually "... to participate effectively as citizens in solving basic economic problems," (Progressive Education Association, p. 202) a very real concern to Americans in the 1930's.

That those who served on the Progressive Education Association's Committee on the Function of the Social Studies in General Education remained leaders in the field of social studies education for years to come

must be interpreted as a validation of the proposals presented in The Social Studies in General Education.

Stanford Education Conference

While the Stanford Education Conference of 1938 was a one-time meeting of the participants rather than the summary of a lengthy investigation as the other three documents, it did capture the thinking of those concerned with the role of social studies in American schools. The participants constituted leaders in the field, many directly engaged in teacher education. Kilpatrick was there; so was Quillen; so was Lewis Mumford, the great American social critic, E. E. Robinson, professor of history at Stanford, and William F. Ogburn, professor of sociology at the University of Chicago. When they described what social studies education ought to contribute to the education of youth, they took their stand with the Progressives. Quillen approvingly noted that "as a result of widesrread evidence of social incompetence," (Stanford Education Conference, p. 247) school curricula had been modified to include (1) the study of social, economic, and cultural history along with the traditional political and military history, (2) social living courses to satisfy adolescent needs to experience directly socializing situations, (3) the problems approach where students worked cooperatively on problems jointly identified by their teachers and themselves, and (4) the utilization of the community as a laboratory and a place where students actively participated (Stanford Education Conference, p. 247-249). Quillen wrote that "... democracy implies respect for the individual, cooperative participation in activities of common concern, and the extension of the application of intelligence..." (Stanford Education Conference, p. 254).

Grayson N. Kefauver, chairman of the conference, echoed Quillen when

he urged that "the development of social competence is a responsibility of the social studies..." (Stanford Education Conference, p. 261). He and the other participants of the 1938 Stanford Education Conference captured the essence of the earlier reports that dealt with social studies education. Again, students were to be actively involved in analyzing contemporary affairs; the social sciences were to be tapped for the data needed to gain socio-civic understanding; the scientific method was to guide students as they, often in groups, dissected current problems and determined acceptable solutions; and democratic principles were to be upheld throughout.

IV. THE SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHER AND CIVIC EDUCATION

The same observation might also have been made about the textbooks intended for the preparation of teachers of social studies and of the publications of the National Council for the Social Studies which appeared during the late 1930's and early 1940's. Edgar Wesley of the University of Minnesota, for example, in his Teaching the Social Studies proposed that "the schools should so condition pupils that they not only will not oppose, but will gladly accept social improvements when they appear " (Wesley, p. 37). Changes in the nation and the world of the 1930's needed to be accompanied by curriculum changes in the social studies, such as the inclusion of consumer education, propaganda analysis, critical thinking activities, and Latin American studies and international relations and the utilization of community resources; Wesley's objectives for civics showed his awareness of the recommendations made by educators in the 1930's.

The journal Social Education of the National Council for the Social Studies was founded in 1937 to serve social studies teachers by furthering scholarship in the social studies, by dealing with current social realities and concerns, and by relating the teaching-learning process to social studies instruction. Its first issue examined the role of social studies

in the curriculum techniques of citizenship involvement in school affairs, the New Deal, methodological questions, namely how to study war and the use of a social science laboratory, and newly published social science book (Social Education, January, 1937, passim). The issue which followed had a similar thrust.

Besides Social Education, the National Council for the Social Studies also publishes a yearbook. Reflecting the concerns of educators in this field, the yearbooks from 1937-1942 had the following titles: The Contributions of Research to the Teaching of the Social Studies (NCSS, 1937), The Utilization of Community Resources in the Social Studies (NCSS, 1938), In-service Growth of Social Studies Teachers (NCSS, 1939), Economic Education (NCSS, 1940), Social Studies in the Elementary School (NCSS, 1941), andTeaching Critical Thinking in the Social Studies (NCSS, 1942). In keeping with progressive education and the landmark reports of the 1930's on social studies education, an activity-oriented social studies classroom was again proposed to expose students to the social sciences and history that they might develop social competence, political acumen, respect for democratic ideals, the disposition to address current political, economic, and social issues, and to care for their community, the nation, and the world.

V. CONCLUSION

These goals of social studies education appear as appropriate today as they did back in the 1930's. Their urgency is validated by such distorted social phenomena as drug consumption, crime and violence, divorce and single parenthood, and teenage suicide. To enable social studies teachers to implement these goals, however, demands support and assistance on the part of the educational establishment. That includes educational

administrators, curriculum specialists and supervisors, school board members, professors of education, the social sciences, or social studies education, political leaders and activists, and the community-at-large. Given the recent political campaign and voter turnout, a reinvigoration of social studies education may well provide the remedy which many of us seek.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aiken, Wilford M., The Story of the Eight-Year Study, New York: McGraw-Hill & Co., 1942.

Bagley, William C. and Thomas Alexander, The Teacher of the Social Studies. American Historical Association, Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, Part XIV., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.

Beard, Charles A., and Mary R. Beard, A Basic History of the United States, New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1944.

Beard, Charles A., A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools. American Historical Association, Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, Part VII., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

Bode, Boyd H., Progressive Education at the Crossroads, New York: Newson Publishing Co., 1938.

Brown, B. Frank, Ed., Education for Responsible Citizenship, Report of the National Task Force for Citizenship Education, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1977.

Counts, George S., Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order, New York: The John Day Co., 1932.

Cremin, Lawrence A., The Transformation of the School, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Dewey, John, Democracy and Education, New York: Macmillan Paperbacks, 1961.

Dewey, John, Experience and Education. Kappa Delta Pi Lecture, 1938, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1955.

Ducharme, Raymond A., Charles A. Beard and the Social Studies, New York: Teachers College Press, 1969.

Gross, Carl H. and Charles C. Chandler, The History of American Education, Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1964.

Horn, Ernest, Methods of Instruction in the Social Studies. American Historical Association, Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, Part XV, New York: Charles Sribner's Sons, 1937.

Kilpatrick, William H., Education and the Social Crisis, New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1932.

Kilpatrick, William H., "The Project Method," Teachers College Record, XIX, 1918, pp. 319-335.

Krey, A. C., Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission. American Historical Association, Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

Merriam, Charles E., Civic Education in the United States. American Historical Association, Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, Part VI New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

Merriam, Charles E., The Making of Citizens, A Comparative Study of Methods of Civic Training, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.

Progressive Education Association, Commisssion on Secondary School Curriculum, The Social Studies in General Education. A Report of the Committee on the Function of the Social Studies in General Education, New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., 1940.

Social Education, Washington, D.C.: The National Council for the Social Studies, 1937.

Stanford Education Conference, Social Education, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1939.

Washburne, Carleton, and Myron M. Stearns, New Schools in the Old World, New York: The John Day Co., 1926.

Wesley, Edgar Bruce, Teaching the Social Studies, 2nd Ed., Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., 1942.

Wilson, Howard E., Education for Citizenship. The Regents' Inquiry, New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1938.

Wrightstone, J. Wayne, and Doak S. Campbell, Social Studies and the American Way of Life, Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson & Co., 1942.

THE TWO CULTURES OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

James S. Leming

Southern Illinois University

The head has lost touch with the body. The intelligentsia frequently represents the teachers to the general public in a way that distorts the purposes and practices of the profession. Little if any dialogue exists between the two cultures. Distrust and lack of respect are rampant.. Stagnation and decreasing credibility plague social studies education. How did we get this way and is there a way out?

"We have met the enemy and he is us" - Pogo

In 1959 C. P. Snow in a pamphlet-length book The two cultures and the scientific revolution argued that the whole of Western society is increasingly split into two cultures, one scientific and one literary. These cultures, according to Snow, have almost ceased to speak to each other; the result is a practical, creative, and intellectual loss. Between these two cultures exists a chasm of mutual incomprehension, sometimes hostility and dislike, but most of all a lack of understanding. At the foundation of this gulf between the cultures is a perspective on the possibility of social amelioration. The scientific cultures believes that it is important to improve man's social condition and inclined to think it can be done. The scientists "have the future in their bones." The literary intellectuals think otherwise; their optimism regarding the future is shallow. Where the clashing of the two cultures ought to produce creative changes, the two cultures find they can't and won't talk to each other.

The argument I wish to make in this paper is that a similar problem of intellectual cultures also besets what we refer to as social studies

education. This problem has been present since the beginning of the social studies in 1916. The gap between the two cultures of the social studies has grown wider over the time until at present, it is so great as to imperil the very existence of anything that could be called the "social studies profession."

The Two Cultures

To my knowledge James Shaver is the only observer of social studies education to point out the problem that these two cultures pose to the profession. In his presidential address of 1976 Shaver (1977) discussed with great clarity and insight the mindlessness and faddishness rampant in the profession. In the National Society for the Study of Education 1981 Yearbook he discussed the differences in viewpoint between the intelligentsia and teachers (Shaver, 1981). Both of these articles have been largely ignored by the profession. These two articles have provided the intellectual scaffolding on which I have based this article. Of course he is in no way responsible for my interpretation of his ideals. Shaver (1981) defined the intelligentsia as "...those who think about the social studies as a major part of their professional lives, in contrast to the teachers who "do" social studies. It (the distinction) is not intended to be derogatory or laudatory, but to suggest professional orientation (p. 107)."

I will discuss the differences between the two groups in terms of the concept of culture. By culture I am referring to a body of customary beliefs, values, and practices constituting a distinct complex of tradition for a group. In what way do these two cultures differ with regard to the nature of social studies education? I first want to present an intelligentsia perspective followed by descriptions of the perspective of

the teachers who "do" social studies. I realize that in drawing these general characterizations the risk is run of oversimplification and distortion of a more complex and varied profession. My position is not that this characterization is the entire picture, but rather that these two cultures, as described below are the two dominant forces that shape the nature of social studies education. I recognize that within each culture considerable diversity exists. My paper is based on the premise that the positions I have delineated are the dominant ones within each group.

Just this year Engle and Ochoa (1988) published the latest in a long line of books on the goals of social studies education. Engle and Ochoa are distinguished members of the social studies profession both having served as presidents of the National Council for the Social Studies. Their view of the proper goal of social studies education is consistent with a long history of social studies rationales that today represent mainstream thought among the intelligentsia of the profession. Engle and Ochoa argue that "If effective democratic citizenship is our goal the persistent study of social problems is at the very heart of the social studies endeavor (p. 105)." The purpose that the study of social problems serves is that they enable the teacher to "countersocialize" the child. Socialization is defined as the process by which every society inducts its young into its customs, values and behaviors. The problem is that socialization is a conserving process, transmitting values grounded in the past. It does not prepare for the future. It fits children into the existing social order "... in a democracy the socializing process must be balanced by countersocialization, which emphasizes independent thinking and responsible social criticism. These abilities are fundamental to improving the quality of democratic life in a changing pluralistic nation ... (p. 34)." Engle

and Ochoa believe that this countersocialization could begin as early as fourth grade and certainly by junior high. Countersocialization will help youth to think independently and "to participate actively in the improvement of society (p. 112)." Engle and Ochoa are not timid in their advocacy of the viewpoint: "...countersocialization is the real goal of citizenship education in a democracy and we should hasten to embrace it before its too late (p. 113)." One further insight into their point of view comes from their rejection of the argument that students are too immature to deal with difficulty and complex social problems: "The answer to this, if not now, when... what agency is better situated than the school to provide a balanced and unpressured environment in which student can try their own wings at dealing with reality (p. 115)."

Contrast this view of the intelligentsia with the view of the teacher cultures on the purposes of social studies education. Stake and Easley (1978) in their detailed ethnographic study of social studies teachers in eleven school districts found that socialization was the pre-emptive aim of schooling. While each teacher may have had a somewhat different set of purposes the common and vigorously defended purpose was socialization "... observance of the mores of the community, submitting personal inclinations to the needs of the community, conforming to the role of the good student, and getting ready for the next rung on the educational ladder (p. 19:4)." The teachers of social studies were carefully selected to fit the community and were anxious not to put children or parents in anguish. Most teachers used the subject matter to socialize and carefully steered away from values questions.

A more recent ethnographic study of social studies teachers in six school districts found a similar "real world" approach to the teaching of

social studies (McNeill, 1986). McNeill found that a major preoccupation of social studies teachers was a concern that students maintain positive attitudes toward American institutions. Teachers therefore limited students access to knowledge by the deliberate selection of content to distance students from injustices and inadequacies of economic and political institutions. On a more instrumental level McNeill refers to this process as the "negotiation of efficiencies." Teachers calculate how much of their knowledge (of course content) to put at risk in the classroom given the small professional and financial rewards and the risk of classroom disorder posed by dissent and conflict. Thus the control of knowledge by teachers is as much a desire for classroom control as it is for the selective distribution of information to prevent the development of cynicism in students.

In addition to the two ethnographic studies discussed above there is additional evidence from surveys of teacher practices in the classroom that reinforce the picture of control and socialization as a dominant view of the purposes of social studies in schools (Fontana, 1980; Weiss, 1978). There is also evidence that teachers of social studies do not attach the same importance to citizenship as a goal that the intelligentsia do. In the High School and Beyond study social studies teachers ranked citizenship education fifth as a goal of education behind basic literacy, good work habits and self discipline, academic excellence and personal growth (Rutter, 1986). Fontana (1980), in a national random survey of 1,000 social studies teachers found that only 53 percent agreed that to promote activity in social and political organizations was an important goal of social studies. Over 95 percent agreed that the primary purpose of social studies is to teach students to think critically and constructively about

society.

Yet another indication of the gulf between the intelligentsia and teachers is the preoccupation of the intelligentsia with academic freedom. One theme that is almost de rigueur in speeches of presidents of NCSS is academic freedom, yet this is not perceived as a major problem by teachers. In the recent NCSS survey of the profession (Educational Research Service, 1987), when asked to rank the major issues facing the profession college and university faculty listed "parental and special interest group attempts to censor" as the number one issue. This did not appear at all among the top five issues for either the K-6 or 7-12 teachers.

Woodward (1988) analyzed sixty-four articles about censorship in professional journals over a ten year period. Fifty percent of the articles took a "liberal" position, that is, they emphasized profession perogative and Fifth Amendment rights. Eleven percent were classified as "balanced" in that they attempted to discuss censorship in terms of complex issues, values, and interests. Six percent took a "conservative" position and emphasized the importance of parental rights. The remainder had a descriptive emphasis with no particular position being taken. Social Education published eight "liberal" articles over this ten year period and none that represented other perspectives (balanced or conservative).

Can the abyss between the intelligentsia and the world of teachers be as great as portrayed above? Separate journals exist for both groups: Social Education for teachers and Theory and Research in Social Education for the intelligentsia. At the annual meeting of the NCSS the College and University Faculty Assembly meet a day before the sessions that are planned for teachers. An examination of the meeting program also reinforces, the very different set of concerns the two groups have. It is easy to document

that mainstream tradition of progressive reformist view of citizenship education has, with only minor shifts of course, persisted among the intelligentsia since the origin of the social studies in 1916. There is also ample supporting evidence that the picture of the real world of social studies teachers is accurate and stable over the past seventy years.

The problems that this situation posses for the profession are many. Imagine a medical profession where chiropractors, christian scientists, faith healers, and brain surgeons are all card carrying members of the profession. I would argue that the differences within the social studies are similar and that the impact is destructive to the point of threatening the very viability of the profession. The head has lost touch with the body. The intelligentsia frequently represents the teachers to the general public in a way that distorts the purposes and practices of the profession. Little if any dialogue exists between the two cultures. Distrust and lack of respect are rampant. Stagnation and decreasing credibility plague social studies education. How did we get this way and is there a way out?

Why the intelligentsia are political and social progressives

At the heart of understanding contemporary social studies education one must understand how citizenship became the focal organizing rationale. The appearance of a curricular area called the social studies in the second and third decades of the twentieth century can not be divorced from broad changes taking place in society that produced a sense of crisis among the educationally and politically powerful. The report of the National Education Association Committee on the Social Studies in the Secondary Schools in 1916 was a response to a changing political, economic, and social terrain. There existed broad-based concern over what would happen

to traditional American values in an America characterized by a shift from rural to urban life, agricultural to industrial economics, increasing tides of immigration, municipal corruption, and the many problems associated with urbanization. The founders of the social studies felt that a set of disparate courses would be no substitute for a loss of community and no solution for dealing with new social problems facing the United States. The crisis required that students possess the appropriate information, values, and participatory skills to be active citizens and improve what was seen as a deteriorating social and political environment. The progressive ideology emerging at this time has a strong social amelioration aspect to it. The emphasis was on purging society of a corruption and liberating it from a past that had overly relied on authority and class distinction. This progressive spirit achieved its sharpest focus in the field of education in the writings of Counts (1932) and the curriculum of Rugg (1930). Fitzgerald (1979) sums up the impact of the Committee on Social Studies on education in the following manner: "Under the noble standards of usefulness, they turned American history into civics and civics into propaganda for their version of the social good (p. 174)." The history of the social studies over the past 70 years has been the history of the succeeding views of the active citizen engaged in the promotion of a version of the social good. While the focus may shift from time to time from participation to decision making, to values, as Fitzgerald notes the profession always comes "... reeling back to the old lamppost of citizenship training." This preoccupation with citizenship is not without cost and it is to the adequacy of citizenship as the basis for social studies to which I now want to turn.

The Chimera of Citizenship

I see three major problems with citizenship as the rationale par excellence of the social studies. First, the goals of citizenship are indistinguishable from those of schooling in general, for if citizenship education of citizens then it is anything in schools. Even if one examines some of the more specific definitions of the components of citizenship education it is increasingly difficult to see areas that justify placing citizenship within any one subject area. For example in science education Project Synthesis (Harms and Yager, 1981) urges that should help students to use science to cope with an increasingly technological world and it should produce informed citizens prepared to deal responsibly with science related social issues. Similarly the emerging field of Science-Technology-Society has a recurrent theme that students will develop problem-solving and decision-making skills and will be encouraged to participate in the community as active citizens. Historically, the field of environmental education has strongly emphasized citizen action. Another trend, more nascient than STS, is democratic environments in schools. Teaching thinking skills is another area to which the social studies has no exclusive claim.

A second problem with citizenship as the goal of social studies is that it inevitably embroils teachers and students in unexamined positions on the goals of social studies education. Of course there is no such thing as any curriculum that is ideologically neutral, but at the heart of citizenship education is a perspective on the role of a good citizen as an active citizen that excludes alternative, and defensible positions.

One recurrent theme of the progressivist rationales for social studies education is that the widespread and active participation of citizenry is a

positive state for the United States. While I do not wish that my comments below be interpreted as against citizenship participation I do wish to show how complex the question of citizenship participation is.

It is usually understood that the American revolution and the subsequent development of a constitution was a shift from monarchy to broad based republicanism where virtue no longer resided in the king or an aristocracy, but rather in the people. Wood's (1969) reinterpretation of the American revolution and subsequent constitutional development holds a different perspective on the nature of citizen participation in our democracy. Wood's position is that in the end the radical republican revolution was subverted by an aristocratic counter-revolution. This counter-revolution was accomplished in the constitutional period by enlarging the area of republican government from a local to a national level so that only socially prominent or widely known men could win elections.

The classic or traditional theory of democracy holds that full participation in all aspects of community and national life is desirable. This participation facilitates rational examination of political problems and the resulting public policy is the result of this extensive and informed debate. The revisionist (or elitists) theory of democracy (Schumpeter, 1962; Dahl, 1956) distinguishes between two groups in society: The political elite and citizens at large. What distinguishes a democratic system from an authoritarian one is the provision for peaceful competition among members of the elite for community support and therefore leadership positions. Among the doctrines associated with revised democratic theory are that political inactivity is a sign of satisfaction with the operation of the system (passive consent); political apathy is not seriously

dysfunctional, in fact it may help; a concern for the stability of the system; and agreement on democratic norms among political leaders is more important than consensus among common citizens. Irving Morrissett (1981) is to my knowledge the only member of the social studies intelligentsia to present this perspective on the "good citizen" as an alternative to the profession.

The purpose of presenting the above perspective is to argue that there is at least one alternative view of the "good citizen" that has potential implications for citizenship education. This perspective has never received serious discussion by the intelligentsia of the profession. One sign of the intellectual health and vitality of a profession is the degree that it critically examines the knowledge that it generates and the assumptions on which it operates. For example, when in the library this summer I picked up the latest copy of the American Psychologist, 43(6), June, 1988. This issue of a journal that is published monthly contained 14 letters critiquing or commenting on articles published in prior issues. A check of other recent issues indicated that this level of response was typical. Now contrast this with the level of reaction in Theory and Research in Social Education, the journal of the intelligentsia in academic of the social studies. In the 16 volumes and fifteen years of the journal since its inception in 1973 there have been fourteen letters or articles that have reacted to a previous article. What is especially disturbing about this finding is the number of highly controversial positions that have been taken in TRSE that have not been responded to. That the social studies should prepare school children revolutionaries to lead us to some alternative utopian society is met with silence within the pages of TRSE. Social Education, the journal of the teacher has a better track record of

dialogue, however, when a thematic issue appeared on social studies educators as cultural revolutionaries (Nelson, 1985) there was only one response from the membership and it was from an obscure social reconstructionist organization rich in praise for the issue.

A final area of concern surrounding citizenship as a goal for social studies is that there is no firm theoretical and research base on citizenship eductaion. Longstreet (1985) has argued that the concept of citizenship is so amorphous and takes on so many different meanings that "...it may be used to encourage whatever is happening in the curriculum to go on happening (p. 22)." One of the maddening aspects of being a social studies educator is searching for evidence that the curricula has any impact beyond knowledge level objectives. The preponderance of evidence suggests that social studies education has not had any discernible impact on what the intelligentsia have identified as the significant outcomes of citizenship education. One recent review (Leming, 1985) found little if any evidence that the social studies curricula, no matter what stripe, had any impact on student attitudes, values or behavior. Miller (1985), for example, later found no relationship between the number of social studies courses taken and political participation.

While the reason for such a state of affairs may lie in poor research techniques and design in a complex psychological and educational area. A more reasonable interpretation lies in the conceptualization of the goals of citizenship education and the potential of school curricula, no matter how organized, to significantly alter the dynamics of political socialization. It is unfortunately the case that even the most innovative curricula have had only a marginal influence on the citizenship related variables studied.

One Foot on the Ground

Finally, a few words about the topic this paper originally started out to address, namely, what is unique about the social studies? It should be apparent by now that my answer is related to the perspectives of the two cultures analyzed above. From the perspective of the intelligentsia what is unique is based on a model of the effective citizen who, facing a society in crisis, has the critical thinking skills, values, and social action skills necessary to effectively change society. Although there are a wide variety of positions under this rubric it is the production of rational activist citizens that underlies the scholarship of the intelligentsia and their perspective on what is unique about the social studies. It is a perspective that holds fast to a creative imagination regarding what the social studies should be, not what it is. To date this vision remains just that -- a vision. The intelligentsia has not been successful in influencing the practice in "real world" classrooms to any great extent. Stanley (1981a, 1982b), for example has analyzed the negligible impact of the social reconstructionist position on social studies practice. The constancy of the social studies curriculum and the methods of instruction over time are well documented.

In contrast the "real world" approach of social studies teachers suggests what is unique about the social studies is the content of social studies curriculum. That is, the information found between the covers of the textbooks is the best single source of information about what is unique about the social studies.

Another way of looking at this question is to ask in what way would graduating students be different if the social studies curricula were not in the school curricula? The only effect that research suggests is that

students would know less about history, government, geography, and other topics taught under the social studies curriculum. There is no evidence to suggest that critical thinking, political attitudes, or political participation are to any practical extent effected by the current curricula.

While diversity and dialogue between differing perspectives is a healthy state of affairs within a profession it is difficult, from any perspective, to hold that the current state of affairs in social studies education is healthy. From my perspective the major responsibility for this state of affairs lies with the intelligentsia. The head has, in a manner of speaking, lost touch with the body. The reaction among the intelligentsia to descriptions of what practice is like in the field is all too often merely a gnashing of teeth and baleful lamentations, with little attempt to understand the perspective of their fellow professionals. The intelligentsia from time to time need to plant at least one foot firmly on the ground. Creative imagination about what the social studies should be must be tempered by real world considerations that teachers face in negotiating the curriculum between students, parents, school boards, administration and local and state curricula requirements.

The possibility for creative change in the social studies requires a common meeting ground where meaningful dialogue between the two cultures can take place regarding the purposes that the social studies should serve. Failure to find this ground will insure that a coherent and practical rationale for social studies education will remain elusive.

REFERENCES

Counts, G.S. (1932). Dare the school build a new social order? New York: John Day and Co.

Dahl, R.A. (1956). Preface to democratic theory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Educational Research Service (1987). Survey of members and potential memebsr of the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Engle, S.H. and Ochoa, A.S. (1988). Education for democratic citizenship. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fitzgerald, F. (1979). America revised: History schoolbooks in the twentieth century. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.

Fontana, L. (1980). Status of social studies practices in secondary schools. Bloomington, IN: Agency for Instructional Television.

Harms, N. and Yager, R.F. (Eds.) (1981). What research says to the science teacher (Volume 3). Washington, DC: National Science Teachers Association.

Leming, J.S. (1985). Research on social studies curriculum and instruction. Interactions and outcomes in the socio-moral domain. In W.B. Stanley (Ed.). Review of research in social studies education, 1976-1983, (pp. 123-213). Washington, DC and Boulder, CO: National Council for the Social Studies and Social Science Education Consortium.

Longstreet, W. (1985). Citizenship: The phantom core of social studies. Theory and Research in Social Education, 13(2), 21-29.

McNeill, L. (1986). Contradictions of Control: School structure and school knowledge. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Miller, J.D. (1985, April). The influence of high school social studies courses on young adult political participation. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Nelson, J.L. (Ed.) (1985). The new criticism: Alternative views of social education. (Special Issue). Social Education, 49(5), 368-405.

Rugg, H. (1930). A history of American civilization: Economic and social. Boston: Ginn.

Rutter, R. (1986). Profile of the profession. Social Education, 50, 252-255.

Schumpeter, J.A. (1962). Capitalism, socialism, and democracy (3rd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Shaver, J.P. (1977). A critical view of the social studies profession. Social Education, 41(4), 300-307.

Shaver, J.P. (1981). Citizenship, values, and morality in the social studies. In H.D. Mehlinger and O.L. Davis (Eds). The Social Studies (Eightieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education) (pp. 105-125). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Snow, C.P. (1959). The two cultures and the scientific revolution. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Stake, R.E. and Easley, J.A. (1978). Case studies in science education: Vol. 2 Design overview and general findings. (Publication # 038-000-00376-3). Washington,DC: Government Printing Office.

Stanley, W.B. (1981a). The radical reconstructionist rationale for social education. Theory and Research in Social Education, 8(4), 55-80.

Stanley, W.B. (1981b). Toward a reconstruction of social education. Theory and Research in Social Education, 9(1), 67-89.

Weiss, I.R. (1978). Report of the 1977 national survey of science, mathematics and social studies education. (Publication # 038-000-00364-0). Washington,DC: Government Printing Office.

Wood, G.S. (1969). The creation of the American republic 1776-1787. New York: W.W. Norton.

Woodward, A. (1968). An intellectual wasteland: An analysis of research and scholarship on censorship. Ethics in Education, 8(2), 5.

PRACTICAL COMPETENCE: A RATIONALE FOR SOCIAL EDUCATION

James A. (Tony) Whitson
Louisiana State University

and

William B. Stanley
University of Delaware

Some may question the point of continuing to try to identify or construct a rationale for social studies education... we believe that it is a critical debate which should continue. At present, the greatest danger is that the debate will crystallize in the form of false dichotomies. Among the most pervasive of such false alternatives is the assumption that either the social education curriculum will be determined by truth oriented intellectual objectives, or it will be designed to produce more utilitarian behavioral "competencies."

INTRODUCTION

The debate over the purpose of social education in our schools has continued for more than a century, and there is still no sign of an emerging consensus (Stanley, 1985). Some may question the point of continuing to try to identify or construct a rationale for social education. While we agree that this is a difficult and problematic process, we also believe that it is a critical debate which should continue. At present, the greatest danger is that the debate will crystallize in the form of false dichotomies. Among the most pervasive of such false alternatives is the assumption that <u>either</u> the social education curriculum will be determined by truth oriented intellectual objectives, <u>or</u> it will be designed to produce more utilitarian behavioral "competencies." At times these two approaches are blurred into one as when students are deemed competent if they can recite the "truth" in terms of geographic place names, historical dates, social science concept definitions, the

major causes of the Civil War and so forth.

The recent phase of the educational reform movement poses this false dichotomy by attacking educators for spending too much time on teaching critical thinking or information processing skills and not giving enough attention to content knowledge (e.g., Ravitch and Finn 1987; E.D. Hirsch 1987). These allegations are puzzling on several levels. Numerous studies have documented that very little critical thinking or higher level information processing goes on in our schools (e.g., Goodlad 1984). Second, beyond the truism that, all things being equal, we understand more when we have a greater background knowledge of the topic we are learning, it is not clear how learning increasing amounts of history and social science content would help us educate more competent citizens. Since citizenship education is, at least, a central concern of social education, this is not a trivial question.

For other critics, a more progressive approach to reform would involve reducing the overemphasis on instrumental approaches to social education, e.g., competency-based education rooted in teacher effectiveness research (Aoki 1984). This instrumental view of competence could be countered with another perspective in which competence is seen as "practical action," or social "praxis," which "promotes a theory of many (sic) and society that is grounded in the moral attitude of liberation" (p. 77). The point is to restore meaningful social action in the face of a modern conception of "common sense" which pulverizes social issues "into a multitude of mini-problems...articulated in purely instrumental terms" (pp. 77-78).

The failure to emphasize this conception of practical action in our culture and social education in particular can be linked to the general retreat from the public sphere and civic action. We often lament the

steady decline in voter turnout, and yet, for most of those who do vote, this very act exhausts their political participation. More and more we have adjusted to a culture dominated by "expert" opinion while our confidence to make complex social judgments continues to erode. Many are reduced to what Lausch called (1979, 1983) the "minimal self," a self preoccupied with its own survival on a daily basis and obsessed with the need to find ways to improve self-image as an end. But these efforts are doomed to failure as only the views of significant others - "experts" - are deemed worth considering. A culture racked with such self-doubt, anxiety, and insecurity, is unlikely to promote political competence. Citizenship is reduced to surviving, following rules, and occasionally voting. Politics becomes another variant of consumption wherein the illusion of real choice is promoted in the form of marketing techniques that mask the narrow range of political possibilities. Beyond this, life appears so complex that the average person abandons political action for personal development and survival.

To the extent this is true, it is difficult to imagine how the current mainstream proposals for social education reforms will help to restore meaningful citizenship competence and action. Social studies refers to the study of human action in the social world, and the activity of learning itself takes place within such social action. Consequently, we seek to promote a conception of social education rooted in a restored vision of practical competence as both educational outcome and process. It is not merely a question of restoring a balance between the practical and the instrumental or technical but the realization that a purely instrumental or technical competence is not possible. For just a freedom is required for human life, so also is potentially transformative practical competence

required as the basis for attaining either scientific truth or the technical ability to meet the instrumental demands of daily life.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PRACTICAL

The tradition of practical competence has largely been lost to modern industrial societies, including those with a democratic form of government. Thus, it is very difficult to dramatize the importance of this tradition to social education. The central problem in the current social education curriculum is the dominant emphasis on producing pre-specified "competencies" either for discrete tasks, or for more general "roles" with similarly predetermined functional criteria for successful performance. But the nature of this problem is often subtle and difficult to detect. The social roles rationale proposed by Superka and Hawke (1982) provides an interesting example of this phenomenon. As Superka and Hawke argue,

> Providing historical, economic, and political perspectives for the consumer role is another unique function of the social studies. The emphasis should be on supplying students with conceptual tools they can use to adapt to future changes rather than providing technical skills that may be obsolete in ten years. A tennis instructor can help students make a wise decision about which tennis racquet to buy. A driver's education instructor buying a car. A home economics teacher can help students become aware of the advantages of generic groceries. While social studies can make some contributions at that level, it should focus primarily on providing the larger view. (p. 8)

Note that the stress is on <u>conceptual</u> tools and the broader relevance of history and the social science disciplines. Superka and Hawke hold that it is possible to focus on social roles while "maintaining the intellectual

integrity of history and the social sciences" (p. 32). How then might such an approach be considered non-intellectual? By contrast, of course, with an approach that regards concepts as something more than mere "tools" for functional adaptation.

Although the Superka and Hawke social roles rationale is proposed as an alternative to the more truth-oriented tradition of social studies as the social science disciplines, this functionalist approach is also interested in intellectual development. But intellectual growth is interpreted as the attainment of conceptual tools or intellectual skills for adaptive performance to present and future role demands. In this sense, too, it claims not to be conservative; for it enables dynamic displacement of existing roles and processes. Yet, in fact, it remains conservative in the sense that the goals to be achieved are external to the social education process, i.e., they are derived from academics, business, government, labor, and other interests. This same sort of criticism can be made of generic approaches to critical thinking as proposed by Beyer (1979) and others.

But practical competence requires more than functional skills to achieve predetermined goals. What is required cannot itself be produced through any purely technical process of teaching or learning. While some might be persuaded that certain roles such as "citizen," "friend," or "family member" do require more than mere technical competence, the issue is more fundamental. Let us consider the areas of law, medicine and insurance to illustrate the point. We argue here that practical competence related to each of these areas cannot be reduced to technical expertise and pre-specified goals. A lawyer, for instance, must provide technical expertise consistent with an interpretation of the client's interests. So

too, the client must form an interpretation of his or her own interests while making the practical judgment as to how to apply the lawyer's professional knowledge (Davis 1981; Levinson 1984; Simon 1978). The same is true in the medical profession, especially as technology itself produces such an unprecedented proliferation of treatment options that the course of medical action simply cannot be determined as a technical matter, but requires choices that a patient cannot evaluate without engaging in an inter-subjective praxis along with the physician (see for example, Bursztajn et. al. 1981).

The process of insurance sales might seem to offer a counter example, a purely technical process wherein costs and coverage are precise and determined prior to purchase. So here we might have an instance where the insurance agent presents specific options and the consumer can be trained to make a selection consistent with his or her needs. But, in fact, consumer preferences for insurance are often largely determined by a person's orientation to salient "reference groups," and the identification of the appropriate reference group is an interpretative not a technical process. As in the case of law and medicine, the consumers self-representation requires inter-subjective praxis in which the experienced underwriter contributes the benefit of practical competence that cannot be technically derived or produced, and that the lay consumer will not have attained for him or herself.

Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977) did recognize a practical tradition (i.e. Reflective Inquiry) which was distinct from other such as Citizenship Transmission or teaching the structure of the social science disciplines. Where they were not successful was in (1) fully clarifying what it is about reflective inquiry that makes it more than just a source of teaching

54

strategy for carrying out structural and functional programs, or (2) in articulating the principles by which a third approach would identify appropriate content for social education without falling back on the criteria of structural or functional approaches. Still, they were on the right track in their emphasis on the study of human action in the social world, and the learning process itself is conducted within such social action. On occasion, Barth and Shermis have oversimplified this by reducing real problems to those that are "student felt" (Stanley and Maxcy 1984; Maxcy and Stanley 1986). This is not a relevant consideration for the selection of content since what students feel are problems might be a trivial and inadequate criterion for content selection. However, is at some point in the learning process students do not come to perceive the problem under study as a genuine problem, practical competence will not likely develop. Instead, social learning will be reduced to a sort of technical formalism in which students apply skills to pseudo problems with externally determined criteria used to assess performance.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL AND LINGUISTIC ROOTS OF THE PRACTICAL TRADITION

The practical tradition focuses on human action, or _praxis_, to use Aristotle's word. Aristotle distinguished practical competence (phronesis) from the proficiencies involved either in _episteme_ (scientifically-certain knowledge of essences) or in _techne_ (instrumental technique or skill for production (_poiesis_) of pre-specified results). For Aristotle, practical competence was the competence required for personal and social action (i.e., _praxis_) by which robust personalities would emerge within a _polis_ that would be conducive to such social and personal formation.

The disappearance of the practical tradition in social studies, and in the curriculum more generally, merely exemplifies a more universal

disappearance of the idea of practical reasoning within our culture. The recovery of practical reasoning has long been one of the principal concerns of the "Frankfurt School" of critical theorists (e.g., Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas), who have been particularly concerned with displacement of the practical by instrumental (technical, functional, or means-end) rationality. The scope of this essay does not permit a detailed account of the philosophical arguments for the centrality of the practical tradition. However, some sources are of particular importance for those seeking a fuller understanding of the issue. These include the work of Gadamer, who has influenced Habermas. Gadamer, in turn, is strongly influenced by Aristotle, Heidegger, and Arendt, a former pupil of Heidegger. Although there are significant differences among these writers, the works of each provide valuable resources for the reformulation that is needed in our current attempts to restore a cultural awareness of the practical.

In the curriculum field Schwab (1978), Westbury (1972a,b), and Reid (1978, 1981) have all emphasized aspects of this philosophical tradition in attempts to restore a "practical" approach. They have also appealed to Dewey and the "pragmatic" tradition associated with Peirce, James and Mead. The interplay of pragmatic and Neo-Aristotelean influences in Schwab's career at Chicago is probably too subtle and complex for any very enlightening analysis. However, we should note that in Schwab's treatment of "the practical," he was so concerned to distinguish it from the "theoretical" that he neglected to differentiate between the practical as pertaining to <u>praxis</u>, and the instrumental as <u>techne</u> or technique pertaining to <u>poiesis</u>. He is followed in this neglect by Westbury, particularly in his article (1972a) on curriculum and rhetoric as "art," with "art" used here as the direct translation of <u>poiesis</u> or technically

accomplished (i.e., "artful," cf. "artificial") production of pre-conceived outcomes.

These distinctions are critical to an understanding of curriculum and social education in particular. Technical skill can be distinguished as the kind of productive activity for which programmed learning is a possibility. Praxis, however, requires a kind of practical competence that can only be developed on the basis of practical experience, and knowledge of the practical requires reflexive knowledge of praxis itself. Schwab, Westbury, and Reid often do discuss aspects of the practical that are not reducible to technique. Still, the practical is never categorically distinguished from the instrumental. The problem runs through American pragmatism generally. It could be argued that the ancients themselves never worked out a consistent distinction, and that the "practical" was sometimes used as Schwab does to include both _praxis_ and _poiesis_ as distinct from _theoria_. Still, the ancients recognized the importance of cultivating practical competence that could not be learned as instrumental technique, or as epistemologically-oriented method.

Fidelity to the ancients is obviously not what we are concerned about here. Rather, our concern is for practical competence in our own time. American pragmatism is the tradition appealed to by Barr, Barth, and Shermis in social studies. We shall see that they are right, but that a broader view of the tradition including classical, phenomenological approaches, and linguistic competence is required for an account of "the practical" that will be adequate as an alternative to functional and structural rationales for the curriculum.

Aristotle's _praxis_ refers to the conduct of social life, especially in its ethical and political dimensions. Our heritage from Peirce includes

the general philosophical approaches of "pragmatism" and "pragmaticism" (at first sight glaringly incompatible with Aristotle's approach), as well as the more particular linguistic or semiotic study of "pragmatics". Pragmatics, semantics, and syntatics are three aspects of semiotics, or the general study of signs and communicative signification. Whereas semantics studies the relationship of signs to their referents, and syntatics studies relationships among signs, pragmatics studies the human use of signs (cf. Morris, 1964).

As action, praxis refers to the enactment, or the actual realization, or particular acts from among the conceivable infinity of alternative possible actions that human agents might be capable of in particular situations. The paradigm case is the verbal utterance. Rules of syntax allow for an infinity of sentences to be grammatically possible within a given language; but neither grammar nor logic can determine which, among the infinity of comprehensible sentences, the human speaker will or should utter in any particular situation. Similarly with any action: the structure of the human condition may limit the possibilities for action in some ways; but a virtual infinity of actions is still possible, and neither technical or structural knowledge is sufficient to determine the particular action to be taken by a competent human agent. Hence, the need for a specifically practical competence, or phronesis.

At this point we can begin to see that linguistic pragmatics is at least continuous with Aristotle's treatment of praxis as ethical and social action. Competence for verbal interaction is simply the paradigm case of social competence generally. What we are seeking to demonstrate is that action in the social requires competence for intersubjective interpretations of personal and group interests within a linguistic and

historical community, rather than a purely technical or functional proficiency for dealing with others on the basis of strategic calculation of their expectations and responses.

The community is also involved in an individual's internal speech, a point noted by Duncan (1969, pp. 82-83) in a discussion of Peirce. According to Duncan, Peirce held that no person can be an absolute individual since one's thoughts are what one says to oneself. Thus as "one reasons, ...it is the critical self that one is trying to persuade, and all thought becomes a sign and such significations compose the nature of language..." Furthermore, a person's social circle can be understood as a "loosely compacted person" (pp. 201-202). The essentially social character of the practical, and the practical character of the social (i.e., its non-reducibility to functional or technical productive efficacy) might seem securely established, supported as it seems to be by Vygotsky, Bruner, and Peirce, as well as Aristotle. Could there be anyone who disagrees, or are we merely belaboring the obvious?

Some functionalists could argue that practical competence is more than functional skill, but insist nonetheless that the functional skills come first: they are thought to be the "basic" skills needed as a "basis" for the more pragmatics competence. But, in fact, the attainment of functional skills depends on the level of previously developed pragmatic competence. Functional task performance can only occur within practical human action, and the practical determines, and is needed to determine, any functional task to be performed. It is the practical which is basic, the prerequisite upon which functional proficiency depends. If some activity is defined as a task, then it presupposes the practical determination of the desired outcome by which that task is defined. Any account of human action is

incomplete if efforts are described purely as tasks, with regulative outcomes presupposed. To perform any task, knowing how to proceed, one must know what the task demand; and this requires an understanding of *what* one is *doing*, or what one is performing the task *for*. *Poeisis* or productive activity can be described, without loss, as a purely technical process *only if* the underlying practical competence can be taken for granted. Without pragmatic definition of the task to be completed, there is no skillful performance possible. Where there is no basis for determining the task to be accomplished, the most incompetent solution may be reached by accurate execution of an inappropriate algorithm.

Beyond this, we argue that even learning how to execute the algorithm is a task embedded in pragmatic action at a more elemental level. Ultimately we reach the level of symbolic meaning-production itself, so we can see one aspect of the unity of social praxis and linguistics pragmatics. We will explore this at the level of production and interpretation of the verbal utterance, which takes us outside the specific domain of social studies, but will serve to demonstrate the foundational importance of social education.

Let us begin with Jerome Bruner, latter-day proponent of phenomenology and hermeneutics. Bruner (1982) provides us with a good illustrative example, which he credits to Dell Hymes. He notes that one can know "how to construct well-formed sentences and to use lexicon in an appropriate referential way and still be a linguistic *idiot savant*" (p. 838). However, such knowledge is not sufficient for a person to understand that the question " Would you be so kind as to pass the salt?" is not a query regarding the limits of one's compassion. The same is true of culture. While we have grammatical constraints in language, there remains an

"enormous scope for operating within and for using those constraints in getting things done, especially in getting meaning established" (pp. 838-839).

Paul De Man (1979) extracts even more radical implications from the same basic insight. In a dialogue from the television show "All In The Family," Edith asks Archie Bunker if he would like to have his bowling shoes laced over or under. Archie replies "What's the difference?" to which his wife responds by patiently explaining the literal difference between the two forms of lacing. Of course, all Archie meant to say was that "I don't give a damn what the difference is." Here is a case where the same grammatical structure can have two exclusively different meanings. While the issue related to bowling shoes might be trivial, this is not always the case. What is a proponent of deconstruction such as Nietzsche or Derrida

> asks the question "What is the Difference" --and we cannot even tell from his grammar whether he "really" wants to know "what" the difference is or is just telling us that we shouldn't even try to find out. Confronted with the question between grammar and rhetoric, grammar allows us to ask the question, but the sentence by means of which we ask it may deny the very possibility of asking. For what is the use of asking, I ask, when we cannot even authoritatively decide whether a question asks or doesn't ask? (De Man 1979, pp. 9-10)

De Man's style and unfamiliar nuances should not discourage serious consideration of what he is doing here. De Man, Hymes, and Bruner are all pointing to the competence for rhetorical praxis that is needed in speech and understanding. Both the production or the understanding of a sentence

require interpretation of what it is the speaker means to do by uttering the sentence, just as the determination of a task requires interpretation of what one means to do by performing the task, or what one is performing that task for. Knowledge of grammar and logic may be necessary, but they may be employed only on the basis of the pragmatic competence we know as rhetoric. The pedagogical implications of the "deconstructionism" represented here by De Man are presented in Ulmer (1985) and in Atkins et al. (1985).

In his book On Literacy, Robert Pattison (1982) quotes some George Burns and Gracie Allen dialogue comparable to the exchange between Archie and Edith. His comments introducing and following the dialogue concern a cultural form reflecting on our awareness of the nature of social and pragmatic competence. Pattison refers in particular to the form of illiteracy represented by the clown.

> The clown carries insensitivity to language to its absurd, illiterate extreme. He operates like a computer, capable of spewing forth words, sentences, puns, apercus, but unconscious of what he does. . . .The clown is programmed to understand language only in its most literal form. He cannot adjust for context, tone, or nuance. (pp. 13-14)

If we were to find an entire culture sunk in such illiteracy, we might expect to find that its educational system had lost sight of the nature of human competence, and had begun training people to operate stupidly, like computers. Education students might be found using textbooks (cf. Gagne & Briggs 1979) based on the idea that everything to be learned in school can be analyzed as a task, and described using computer flowcharts to diagram the hierarchy of subroutines and the sequence in which they will be

executed in performance of the higher-order task. The understanding of Hamlet's soliloquy could then be approached (Gagne & Briggs 1979, p. 130) as

> a problem-solving task, or more precisely a whole set of problems, in which subordinate rules must be applied to the generation of higher-order rules. The latter cannot be exactly specified, of course, since one does not know exactly how the student will solve each problem.

As for the task of "recognizing metaphors" (p. 131):

> Obviously, a metaphor is a concept, and since it is not something that can be denoted by pointing, it must be a defined concept. The performance to be expected of the student, then, will be one of classifying a metaphor in accordance with a definition. [emphasis in original]

While recognizing the potential existence of alternative algorithms available to the student, Gagne and Briggs still see these as tasks that can be performed algorithmically. The same approach in social studies is proposed for tasks such as interpreting bar charts and applying knowledge of judicial review (pp. 131-2; for the pragmatic nature of judicial review, see Whitson, 1989). As task analysis research becomes more sophisticated and more interesting, it still cannot succeed in accounting for pragmatic speech and action, which in principle defies the specificity of ends needed to define a task as such. It is this failing by the best of functionalist education scholars that compels rejection of instrumental "competencies" as the basis for curriculum.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

This is not the place to describe in detail how a social studies

program oriented by practical competence would likely operate. Indeed, there is much work to be done in this area, and many important questions and difficulties remain to be resolved. One of the difficulties that remain is a specific working out of how to use the authentic knowledge of the social science disciplines in a way that promotes rather than displaces the purpose of fostering the real competence for active democratic citizenship.

For another thing, educators and boards of education seem to prefer the illusion of control and certainty that a social education program based on attaining predetermined instructional objectives offers. No doubt, it is also easier to plan instruction when the specific objectives are known prior to teaching. What we propose is more complex and uncertain since one cannot use direct instruction to teach practical competence. Teachers can, however, create learning situations wherein the opportunity to acquire practical competence if provided. This requires that students be confronted with problematic social situations they come to see as genuine to the extent that they are motivated to make judgments aimed at social action or praxis.

The personal and social identities of free democratic citizens are formed through their exercise of practical competence, their praxis. This requires a culture that ensures the conditions for genuine critique and human emancipation. Social education should settle for nothing less.

REFERENCES

Aoki, Ted T. Competence in teaching as instrumental or practical action: A Critical analysis. In Edmund C. Short (ed), Competence: Inquiries into its meaning and acquisition in educational settings. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984.

Atkins, G. Douglas & Johnson, Michael L. (Eds.). Writing and reading differently: Deconstruction and the teaching of composition and literature. Lawrence: U. P. of Kansas, 1985.

Barr, Robert D., Barth, James L., & Shermis, S. S. Defining the social studies (Bulletin #51). Arlington, VA: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.

Bellah, Robert N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., and Tipton, S. M. Habits of the Heart. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Beyer, Barry K. Teaching Thinking in Social Studies. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1979.

Bruner, Jerome S. The process of education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Bruner, Jerome S. The language of education. Social Research, 1982, 49(4), 835-853.

Bursztajn, Harold, R. I. Feinbloom, R. M. Hamm, & A. Brodsky. Medical Choices, Medical Chances. New York: Delacorte, 1981.

Davis, Michael H. Critical jurisprudence: An essay on the legal theory of Robert Burt's Taking care of strangers. Wisconsin Law Review, 1981, 419-453.

De Man, Paul. Allegories of reading: Figural language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke and Proust. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Duncan, Hugh D. Symbols and social theory. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Gagne, Robert M. & Briggs, Leslie. Principles of instruction design (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1979.

Goodlad, John I. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw Hill, 1984.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Lasch, Christopher. The Culture of Narcissism. New York: Warner Boos, 1979.

Lasch, Christopher. The minimal self: Psychic survival in troubled times. New York: Norton, 1984.

Levinson, Sanford. Law as literature: Do legal texts have authoritative interpretations? In T. L. Haskell (Ed.), The Authority of Experts. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Maxcy, S. J. and Stanley, W. B. Reflective inquiry, reconstructionism, and positivism: A reexamination of the issues. Journal of Research and Development in Education. (Spring, 1986) 19, 3:62-71.

Morris, Charles. Signification and significance. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1964.

Pattison, Robert. On Literacy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Ravitch, Diane and Finn, Chester. What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know? New York: Harper and Row, 1988.

Reid, William A. Thinking about the curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.

Reid, William A. The deliberative approach to the study of the curriculum and its relation to critical pluralism. In M. Lawn & L. Barton (Eds.), Rethinking curriculum studies. New York: Halstead John-Wiley,m 1981.

Schwab, Joseph J. The practical: A language for curriculum. In J. J. Schwab, Science, curriculum, and liberal education (Ian Westbury and Neil J. Wilkof, Eds.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978. (originally published, 1970.)

Simon, William H. The ideology of advocacy: Procedural justice and professional ethics. Wisconsin Law Review, 1978, 1978 29-144.

Simon, William H. Homo psychologicus: Notes on a new legal formalism. Stanford Law Review, 1980, 32, 487-559.

Stanley, W. B. and Maxcy, S. J. Teaching about problems and problem-solving in social education: Reexamining the issue. The Journal of Thought, (Winter 1984) 19, 4:46-52.

Superka, Douglas P., & Hawke, Sharryl. Social Roles: A focus for social studies in the 1980's. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, 1982.

Ulmer, Gregory L. Applied grammatology: Post(e)-pedagogy from Jacques Derrida to Joseph Beuys. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Weaver, Richard. The ethics of rhetoric. South Bend, IN: Regnery/Gateway, 1953.

Westbury, Ian. The Aristotelian "art" of rhetoric and the "art" of curriculum. Philosophy of Education, 1972, 28, 126-136. (a)

Westbury, Ian. The character of a curriculum for a "practical" curriculum. Curriculum Theory Network, Fall 1972, 25-37. (b)

Whitson, James A. Constitution and Curriculum: Hermeneutical Semiotics of Cases and Controversies in Education, Law and Social Science. London: Falmer, 1989.